

THE MONTH

A CATHOLIC MAGAZINE



NO. 529 (NEW SERIES 139) JULY, 1908

CONTENTS

CATHOLICS AND ATHLETICISM IN ITALY.....	<i>By C. C. Martindale</i>	1
A RATIONALIZED JOAN OF ARC.....	<i>By the Rev. Herbert Thurston</i>	12
A STUDY IN BIGOTRY.....	<i>By the Rev. Joseph Keating</i>	25
SCIENCE IN THE NURSERY.....	<i>By the Editor</i>	45
INDULGENCES. Second Article.....	<i>By the Rev. Sydney F. Smith</i>	50
BROTHER RUFINO.....	<i>By Ethel Ross Barker</i>	68
FLOTSAM AND JETSAM.....		75
De l'Audace!		
Hebrew Poetry.		
A "Birrellism" worth preserving.		
"Anglicanists."		
REVIEWS.....		80
SHORT NOTICES.....		101
BOOKS RECEIVED.....		109
SOME FOREIGN REVIEWS.....		112

LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO
LONDON & ONE SHILLING

STONYHURST PHILOSOPHICAL SERIES.

PSYCHOLOGY:

Empirical and Rational.

BY

MICHAEL MAHER, S.J., D.LIT.; M.A. LOND.

SIXTH EDITION.

(FOURTEENTH TO SEVENTEENTH THOUSAND.)

PRICE 6s. 6d.

1. **Logic.** By RICHARD F. CLARKE, S.J., formerly Fellow and Tutor of St. John's College, Oxford. Second Edition. Price 5s.
 2. **First Principles of Knowledge.** By JOHN RICKABY, S.J., late Professor of Logic and General Metaphysics at St. Mary's Hall, Stonyhurst. Third Edition. Price 5s.
 3. **Moral Philosophy (Ethics and Natural Law).** By JOSEPH RICKABY, S.J., M.A. Lond.; late Professor of Ethics at St. Mary's Hall, Stonyhurst. Third Edition. Price 5s.
 4. **Natural Theology.** By BERNARD BOEDDER, S.J., Professor of Natural Theology at St. Mary's Hall, Stonyhurst. Second Edition. Price 6s. 6d.
 6. **General Metaphysics.** By JOHN RICKABY, S.J. Second Edition. Price 5s.
 7. **Political Economy.** By CHARLES S. DEVAS, M.A. Oxon. Sometime Examiner in Political Economy at the Royal University of Ireland. Third Edition. Revised and Enlarged. (Seventh to Ninth Thousand). Price 7s. 6d.
-

LONGMANS, GREEN, & Co., London, New York, Bombay, and Calcutta.



Catholics and Athleticism in Italy.

—
Co' Fanciulli Fanciullo
Sapientemente.
—

THE Roman Municipality (to prove, perhaps, that it no less than clericals can work miracles) put up some time ago on the Janiculum an inscription of perfect point and untranslatable felicity :

All' ombra di questa quercia | Torquato Tasso | Vicino ai sospirati |
Allori e alla Morte | Ripensava silenzioso | Le miserie sue tutte | E |
Filippo Neri | Tra liete grida si faceva | Co' fanciulli fanciullo | Sapientemente.¹

How else, in so few words, could have been drawn the two full pictures—the melancholy, lonely poet ; the laurels come too late ; the miserable past, the brief, hopeless future : and the grey-haired Saint, mobbed by laughing children, resting breathless after his game, and seeing in the noise and gaiety a fair hope for the City, spread glorious at his feet, and for the Church it symbolized ?

Certainly the old Saint would have rejoiced at the outlook Rome and all Italy has offered him for these few years, though long are the faces pulled by many who do not approve of the extraordinary part which athletics have come to play in the Catholic training of boys in Italy to-day, and who would not have understood St. Philip. The movement is so remarkable, in extent and enthusiasm, and Catholics (rare prerogative !) are so evidently in the van, that our attention and sympathy should be ready and generous.

It was probably first drawn to our notice here, when in October, 1905, the Italian Catholic gymnastic and athletic clubs had their great combined display in the Vatican gardens, and received a stirring allocution from the Holy Father, who

¹ Under the shade of this oak Torquato Tasso, so near to the sighed-for bay-wreath and to death, reflected in silence upon all his sorrows : and Filippo Neri amid glad cries made himself a child with children wisely.

presided. The Pope recalled the incident of the young man whom Jesus loved, but who, in the great effort, had failed. His *will* had yielded: he was not *strong*.

"For my part," said the Pope, "I admire and bless with all my heart your games and amusements, your gymnastics, your cycle and boat and walking races; your mountain-climbing; your expeditions and competitions and displays; for these pastimes, by exacting effort, will snatch you from that idleness which is the mother of every vice, and because even friendly contests will be for you the symbol of emulation in the practice of virtue. And, according to the words of the youngest of the Apostles, the special friend of our Redeemer, who was writing to young men, 'Be strong; and may God be in you, and you will have conquered the Evil One,'—even so I repeat to you, be strong to keep and defend your faith when so many are losing it: be strong to remain devoted sons of the Church when so many are rebelling against her: . . . be strong to conquer all the obstacles which you will meet in the practice of the Catholic religion, for your own merit and for the good of your brothers."

The work has thriven; and we wish it had been earlier and better known in this country that there is to take place at Rome, from September 23—28, an International *Concorso* of Gymnastics and Athletic Sports. The Federation of Italian Catholic Sports' Associations is organizing this in honour of the Holy Father's Jubilee; and we know that efforts were made by it, apparently without success, to secure teams from this country, and from Ireland, and from Scotland:¹ Canada is, however, sending at least two contingents; France and Belgium are nobly represented.

The *Società della Gioventù Cattolica Italiana* decided on the institution of this Federation no longer ago than May 13, 1906. It correlates not only associations definitely and primarily athletic in their aim (these are the *Società federate*, in the stricter sense); but also such institutions as include in their ideal the good physical culture of their members. These are termed *Istituzioni aderenti*. There exist finally isolated honorary members.

The *Gioventù Cattolica* contributes to this Federation 3,000 lire annually; affiliated societies, a minimum of 12 lire;

¹ Were our Colleges, like those in America, to meet often for inter-collegiate matches, and in general to see much more of one another, a combined team might easily, one would have thought, have been sent to Rome.

individuals, of 1 lire, with an entrance fee of 3 lire, which may be compounded for by a lump payment of 30 lire. The Directors are eighteen in number, of whom the *Gioventù Cattolica* elects nine, the *Società aderenti* elect the rest. There are local committees of five elected by the *Federated* societies, whose delegates have a *deliberative* vote at the yearly general meetings. Those of the affiliated societies have a consultative vote only. All affiliated or federated societies must have the approbation of their diocesan.

National competitions are to recur every two years. Dates, numbers, &c., of local competitions are left to local decision: autonomy is generally aimed at.

At the International *Concorso* in September, a ticket of 4 lire will admit the holder to the "military" lodgings provided for such of the competitors as like to use them; to the Vatican gardens, museums, &c.; holders profit by all railroad and restaurant deductions, &c. The sectional competitions of each Nation will be held on special grounds—it had been hoped that the British candidates might have profited by the admirable generosity which sets the exquisite grounds of the Doria Pamfili Villa open to the football and cricket matches of the English and Scotch Colleges at Rome;—the victorious divisions will repeat their display, and the International part of the programme will take place in the Belvedere Cortile of the Vatican before the Holy Father. The whole muster of the competitors marches past the Holy Father at the inauguration of the *Concorso*. Needless to say, all professionals are excluded.

The programme includes (1) the National sectional events; (2) the International competition of victorious sections (in case of a nation being represented by one section only, its display must qualify for the International competition before a special jury); (3) Individual competitions; (4) special events—hanging rope, obstacle race, long and high jump; (5) special games (hockey, lacrosse, football, &c.). The winning Italian section gains the Pius X. Cup, actually held by the *Fulgor* Club of Asti at Biella in 1906.

The winning *sections* obtain a laurel wreath if they win $\frac{1}{10}$ marks: an oak-wreath for $\frac{1}{20}$. We are not so far from the Pythians and Olympians. Who will be our Pindar?

The longest race is to be of 1,500 m., to be achieved in anything under nine minutes: the weight for putting is of ten

kgr. ; in the 100 metres race, twenty marks are given to those who come in in twelve seconds, one mark is deducted for every additional second. The rope is eight metres long ; ten cm. in circumference : hands only ; start, seated on ground. The high jump starts from 1'30 m. and the string is raised five cm. after each turn. The long jump starts from 4'50 m., it is augmented by fifteen cm. up to 4'95, and thence by ten.¹

Special medals are given to the Association which has sent men from the greatest distance, to the most numerous, to that which emerges first in the proportionate evaluation of distance to numbers. Italians were always mathematicians !

There is to be a Cyclists' Meet, a competition in this matter having proved impossible in view of the complete lack of any proper track in or near Rome. The *Stadium* (the *Federazione's* Bulletin),² for February, 1908, pointed out, at some length, that a race through the Roman streets, with their remarkable paving, their abrupt declivities, their cork-screw turns, would present too great a difficulty to foreign competitors. No one thought of the added terror for the foreign pedestrian, already scared to death by the vehicles and bicycles which in theory at least are *not* racing !

To the tremendous enthusiasm, the determination, so visible to-day in whole classes of "young Italy," is added in all this the keen sense of smartness, of picturesque correctness, which the Italian possesses. In consequence few others than experts may be permitted to form an easy judgment on the excellence of what is being done. Yet in the gymnastic displays it jumps to the eyes, while of the general, out-of-rank *tenue*, the lay observer is still capable to judge and to admire. So it was the more surprising that, more than once, when we thought to please our hearer by our praise of all this movement, we found ourselves driven to make its defence. It was curious to find it termed, with implied reproach, the *Culto del Corpo* : had Plato never been read ? Had psychology never been applied ? "To

¹ It should be remembered that the competitors are young ; that the races are run in terribly hot weather ; and the National Races run this month (June) at Rome suggest that European records are not yet to be demanded of Italian athletes. The Olympic Sports in London may, however, teach us better : though the new National Institute of Physical Culture does not perhaps as yet command that respect in Italy which, let us hope, awaits it.

² This excellent little paper, in its third year of life, is full of photos and correspondence from Catholic clubs in all parts of the country, and has a competent foreign column in which the doings of Catholic athletes, especially when pitted against Italians, are registered.

keep boys good, you must keep them occupied" was a sentiment to which we gave ready recognition; but how astonishing that the next words should be, "Yet I can't make people see that." The lesson in this case had been learnt in America.

Be this as it may, the explicitly "Athletic" Leagues are multiplying and improving, and, almost more important, the boys' clubs and sodalities are everywhere changing in tone, admitting amusements more suitable for growing men than in old days; *Ricreatorii Popolari*, *Oratorii Festivi*, are everywhere increasing. The *Stadium* will soon be able to abandon its monthly polemic—conducted with most unusual calm and courtesy (query, a result of the self-control learnt on the playing-fields?)—upon the abstract virtues of athletics. The Salesians, with their admirable sense of what the times demand, are active in this enterprize. At Milan, thirty of these boys' clubs, where games are prominent, exist: some have existed since the days of Cardinal Frederick Borromeo, and will soon celebrate their tercentenary.

It has been our good fortune to make acquaintance with one of these institutions in its ordinary working clothes; and it proved interesting on more than one special ground. First, it is the only thing of the sort possessed by Florence; second, its origin is English.

In Florence, the social problem still has a definitely northern colouring; and the religious needs of the commercial and artisan classes, as of the very poor, clamour for recognition. The rich and the poor indeed have never wholly lacked some attention. Of the first it might be said that the rich have us always with them: and even in the most aristocratic age the poor were regarded as the right field for the display of elegant virtues. But for the tremendous middle-class, grown up, traditionless, since the Revolution, none has cared. Traditionless, for in no country so utterly as in Italy, has the Revolution destroyed tradition: for since in Italy tradition made warp and woof with Authority, the poor are finding that it is perishing now that that old Authority is made away with; while the middle class care nothing for Authority save what they have created, and have as yet no tradition save their own. That even among the poor the tradition is fading, emerges from the following incident—not untypical, we were assured.

"If your son comes to the *Ricreatorio*," said its Director to a mother, "he should come to Mass on Sundays."

"Certainly," she replied, "I should like him to be religious."

"Mass is at 8 o'clock."

"But the poor child is at work all the morning. Don't you ever have Mass in the afternoon?"

Tradition, then, and authority, are gone or going from homes in which family life, by the exigencies of factory-work, is broken up, and where the father, employed, at no fixed hours, by the *servizio pubblico*, is rarely seen.¹

So much we understood, less from our own attempted observation than from the assurance of one who has worked for years among just these classes in Italy. Finally, the dwellings that are no longer homes are too often unfit for human beings, even in the great new suburbs. "More than once," wrote the Florentine *Bandiera del Popolo*, in a most sympathetic account of the *Ricreatorio's* early struggles, "four, five, or even six of the poor boys who come hither, albeit of different families . . . have given as their dwelling-place not only the same *floor* but the same *room* of the same house, which reveals that *it is not necessary to betake one's self to London* to note the squalor and consequent immorality in which our poor must dwell."

It was to reach boys, then, of both these classes that the *Ricreatorio Popolare* of San Giuseppe was opened in November, 1903, at Florence, though the poorer children were its first recruits. Its beginnings were modest, and comprised not much more than a yard and a shed. Swings were put up in the yard: the neighbours protested against football. (Football, by the way—so the matter was explained to us—is an ancient Florentine game, very like Rugby, were it not that the ball is of another size and weight, while some of the rules are not quite the same and the rest are a little different.) However, stilts formed a welcome alternative: possibly the neighbours thought the boys would soon be killed off. Certainly we have never understood how Italian battles on stilts are bloodless. But the boys survived, and their numbers, after a month, reached eighty. Then Mass was suggested—the first introduction of "religion"

¹ Alas, that this should be so true of England! It was a *hoast* we heard once, in the north—"Mary's getting on splendid. She's off before we're up in the morning, and at night she's back so tired that she eats her supper and goes off to bed without a word. She's doing grand."

into the concern. Half left. After three months, catechism was attempted. One-third of the remainder left; especially the bigger boys jibbed at this innovation. There were the ordinary difficulties; gangs formed: *Teppiste* made their appearance; the police had to be invoked. But the work moved steadily for all the defections. It was kept well in mind that *not* on the basis of a sodality was this enterprize to thrive. Drill and cold water were requisitioned rather than Rosary and Little Office, for initial baptism and penance. Essentially *not* a "nucleus" of the very pious was aimed at. One who for twenty-four years had worked an admirable club of some 200 boys at Lucca saw himself obliged to diminish his numbers considerably. He gave the 150 righteous their *congé*, and kept the fifty black sheep. So here, the weekly Mass and catechism¹ sufficed to carry the enterprize through to the quarters where we found it established on our latest visits.

The *Ricreatorio* now stands in the very heart of the new suburb outside the *Barriera delle Cure*, where five years ago were only fields. A plot of some 70,000 square metres was bought on the further bank of the "torrent" Mugnone, a torpid ditch between embankments to-day, unhealthily picturesque when last we knew it. The gratitude and good-will of the Municipality was the return for a present of some 20,000 square metres for new roads² along the Mugnone and perpendicular to it; two small plots and another narrow strip were further deducted from the total of building land for the gradual erection of shops, the rent of which will pay the rates and taxes of the whole building. The entrance corridor passes between the porter's two rooms (in the present inchoate appointments the Director takes his supper, which we were permitted to share, in the porter's bedroom, by the light, if we remember rightly, of a bicycle lamp) to a large vestibule, whence a corridor leads to the left to rooms now used as chapel, schools, &c., later to be wholly consecrated to night-classes. To the right of this corridor is the theatre, a really fine room,

¹ Aided by Night-school—Reading, Writing, Arithmetic, Drawing, and by a Situations Bureau. This was an early and successful venture. It is asked that boys for whom situations are found may be free, if possible, on Sundays, and may at least attend the 8 to 8.30 Mass on Sundays and festivals.

² One of these roads the Municipality was anxious to baptize *via Domenico Cirillo*—a revolutionary hanged at Naples in 1798. A protest was lodged, and the town suggested an English name—Cromwell, for instance! At present the road is marked *via del Ricreatorio* till it shall be decided whether *Milton* or *Raffaele* will prove most suitable as a final appellation.

with a gallery, and scenery painted by the brush of a well-known Catholic English artist resident at Florence. In the back of the vestibule is the Director's office, tenanted at times by the devoted assistant recruited for him from the ranks of the secular clergy. To the right will lie the church, of which the plan alone shows above the ground: its presence betokens prudence as well as piety; for when it was foreseen that a suburb would grow up precisely here it was likewise guessed that no new parish would for long be formed to cope with the new need, and this, as so many new Italian and French suburbs, would risk remaining churchless. On an upper floor will be the Director's rooms, and also rooms for the givers and makers of working-men's retreats, for it is intended that when once the work shall have grown permanent and attained its full dimensions, these retreats, now considered impossible in Florence, shall form a definite part of it. At the back stretches the big yard, in a corner of which is a shed where acetylene gas is made.

Nightly from 6.30 to 7.30, when First Communion is being prepared for, Catechism is explained for the candidates (some fifty made their First Communion last May); then there are gymnastics, drill, or music practice.¹ We had the privilege of seeing all these performances. Two or three young men, themselves sons of prosperous members of the commercial classes, helped in the Swedish drill: the strictly military part was carried out by a smart young sergeant of the 4th Infantry stationed in Florence, who cycles over from his barracks to *give* his services. It is this splendid lay co-operation which makes the *Ricreatorio* so wide in its scope for good. As for the band, we will only say that it is very large indeed, and played Verdi's most tempestuous productions in the vaulted vestibule, and that the very efficient master broke first his *bâton*, then his desk, in the course of the evening's practice. Stunned, we assisted at the brief night prayers, and returned home about 9.30, accompanied by half a dozen small boys, whose paternal care of us during the evening would certainly not have been displayed towards a foreigner by the same number of young English waifs and strays!

On Sundays the hours are 7 a.m. to 11.30, and 2.30 to dusk. Thirty-five to forty minutes are assigned to Mass, sermon (!)

¹ The *Ricreatorio* is to take part in the International *Concorso* next September. The teams may be chosen from the 220 names inscribed on the *Ricreatorio's* registers.

and morning-prayers : half an hour's catechism is given in the evening.

A savings' bank now flourishes alongside of the very prosperous Situations Agency ; periodical dramatic displays of a most ambitious character are given on the stage ; a great outing takes place from time to time, headed by the band in uniform—white knickers, dark jersey with the Florentine lily on the breast, and white forage-cap : the echo of Fiesole is aroused by the strains of *The British Grenadiers*, much to the astonishment of that nymph, if we may judge by the amaze of the Anglo-Florentines who own so many of the villas, perched white among the varied greens of the hillside.

In one of those villas Aloysius Gonzaga lived three centuries ago with his brother and his tutor, and, beneath his picture on a garden wall, the legend prays, " Upon these hills, where as a lad thou didst walk and wast 'ware of God, rain down grace, Luigi Gonzaga, that may, amid this so great smile of earth, recall Heaven unto men." In this small band of noisy ruffians, hard to keep on their knees for five minutes twice a day, yet noble stuff for the Christian citizen our age should yearn to mould, is one of the answers, doubtless, of the young Saint. Florence is full of memories of that holy-boyhood. In the very heart of the town the enormous Church of the Santissima Annunziata guards, in its little corner building where lamps are twinkling, the veiled picture of Mary and Gabriel, before which St. Aloysius made his vow of chastity. That altar seems to be one of the few places in this world where it is difficult *not* to pray, *not* to "be 'ware of God." There can be no doubt that the same power which there stirred him, and of which we are conscious, is energetic in the good work which strives to recall to boys the Heaven, which, in a nature smiling and too often cruel, they are so sorely tempted to forget.

C. C. MARTINDALE.

[POSTSCRIPTUM.—Though through the mercy of Providence we are in no way called upon to give a complete survey of Continental athletics, we should regret to close this paper without a brief reference to the admirable Catholic work which has for ten years been carried on in France under the guidance of Dr. Michaux. Ever since M. de Mun and others gave so strong an initial impetus to all Catholic organizations destined to help the working-man, physical exercise of some sort or

another has characterized them. In 1898 Dr. Michaux founded the *Fédération Gymnastique et Sportive des Patronages de France*, an enterprize scarcely more succinctly known as the F.G.S.P.F. It comprises a central committee; a special gymnastic committee which organizes the programme of the annual competitions and carries them out; a sports committee, which does the same for the general athletic competitions; finally, in each of the federated districts similar gymnastic and sports committees exist. The F.G.S.P.F. co-ordinates the efforts of the local branches, forms a central bureau from which information is obtainable, obtains necessary apparatus, fields, halls, &c., at a cheaper rate than could the individual clubs.

In 1898 twenty-five clubs of Paris and its suburbs took part in the first general display; 600 gymnasts, all told, joined in the "march past." In 1899 the numbers were exactly doubled, some ten *provincial* units entering the lists. In 1900 the Belgian Federation of Catholic Gymnastic and Fencing Clubs sent representatives, and the F.G.S.P.F. had a corridor reserved to itself in the part reserved to Working-men's *Œuvres* in the famous Exposition Universelle. 1902 was marked by a deliberate and generous decentralization: Paris was more rarely to become the scene of the national gatherings: provincial "regions" were formed and flourished. Yet in 1905, 2,500 gymnasts made their display at Versailles before 10,000 spectators.

Athletics as such were less immediately popular. In 1901 five teams entered for the football championship. In 1904—1905 fifty teams entered, and the champion F.G.S.P.F. team beat the champion team of the Union of French Athletic Sports Societies (U.S.F.S.A., we believe), the champion team of France for that year. In the season of 1905—1906, 400 matches were on the cards. Flat races and other events have gained in proportional popularity: in 1907 the *Fédération* had a total of 50,000 members; 40,000 gymnasts and 10,000 "sportsmen."¹

The results of the *Fédération* are universally registered by the French press, and the F.G.S.P.F. has its own bulletin, *Les Jeunes*. Under the presidency of Dr. Michaux, scientific measures prevail: each member, apart from his medical certificate of admission, has his physiological chart on which

¹ The *Vie Nouvelle* for June 7, 1908, has a photograph, quite à l'anglaise, of a football team belonging to the *Jeunesse Catholique* of Chodiu in Cochin-China!

his advance in inches and weight may be displayed to admiring parents and envious younger brethren.

Mr. A. L. F. Smith¹ thought he had grounds to allude with regret to "the attempts made in France in the direction of a system of education . . . more purely intellectual [than ours] in its aims." In the long run this system "becomes far more cramping and stunting than any amount of compulsory athletics. At best it leads to an intellectual arrogance or priggishness which is far more unwholesome, and not less offensive than the swagger of the brainless athlete. The result is an abnormal development of the morbid side of the character."

Almost more truly might he have said that it develops no character at all. But if, as seems likely, this movement grows strong, and declares for athletics as part of all normal Catholic effort for men and boys, an army of fine characters may be enlisted, it is hoped, in the interests of the Christian life. The change was slow in coming. Here too, existing institutions hung back. Games had a brutalizing tendency: it was highly incorrect for grown young men to run about with bare legs. . . . All that could be disregarded, as M. Charles Simon² well pointed out. "Rather is it," exclaimed M. Marcel Prévost, in his inaugural speech at the Olympic Congress of Brussels, "a homage to the human will which is offered by the daily effort . . . to conquer to-day what conquered us yesterday, by the daily determination to be better than our past selves. . . . Thus to exalt the power of the will is the greatest service we can render to contemporary humanity."]

C. C. M.

¹ Writing on "Athletics" for the collection of essays, *The Public Schools from Within*, p. 207.

² *L'Education physique et les Patronages: Jeunes gens de France*, p. 324.

A Rationalized Joan of Arc.

OCCUPYING a full page in a recent number of the *Athenæum*, stands one of those voluminous appeals to the intelligence of the superior person with which the management of the *Times* newspaper has of late years made us so unpleasantly familiar. This particular advertisement does not emanate from Printing House Square, though its eminently "judicious" tone would not be unworthy of such an origin. It deals with the proposed issue by a London publisher of a complete edition of the works of Anatole France in English, and while assuming that the English reader is entirely unacquainted with the writings of that illustrious man of letters, it also delicately conveys the suggestion that unilluminated darkness must be the portion of those who persist in this suicidal ignorance. Outside this country, the publisher informs us, Anatole France shares with Tolstoi the distinction of being "the greatest and most daring student of humanity now living." Whereupon the advertisement continues:

There have been many difficulties to encounter in completing arrangements for a uniform edition, though perhaps the chief barrier to publication here has been the fact that his writings are not for babes—but for men and the mothers of men. Indeed, some of his Eastern romances are written with biblical candour. "I have sought truth strenuously," he tells us, "I have met her boldly. I have never turned from her even when she wore an unexpected aspect."¹ Still, it is believed that the day has come for giving English versions of all his imaginative works, and of his monumental study *Joan of Arc*, which is undoubtedly the most discussed book in the world of letters to-day.

We can hardly suppose that M. Anatole France can have had any hand himself in the drafting of this advertisement, but the mocking insinuation that any pruriency which may be detected in the modern French romance is a sort of distant imitation of the plain speaking of the Bible, is quite worthy of his peculiar genius. It will at any rate not be disputed that the

¹ It is to be noted that this sentence occurs precisely in the Preface to the *Vie de Jeanne d'Arc*, Vol. I. p. lxxxi. "J'ai cherché la vérité sans mollesse," &c.

aspect of Truth which M. France has sought is in accord with her traditional attire, and that this aspect is as yet happily "unexpected" to the ordinary British novel reader. On the other hand, the same notice supplies a variety of biographical details. Thus, it appears, that the French Academician, Anatole Thibault, *dit* Anatole France, was the son of a bookseller on one of the Paris Quais, "from whom the boy caught his passion for the principles of the Revolution, while from his mother he was learning to love the ideals chronicled in the Lives of the Saints." As a result, his work, we are further told,

is illuminated with style, scholarship, and psychology; but its outstanding features are the lambent wit, the gay mockery, the genial irony with which he touches every subject he treats. But the wit is never malicious, the mockery never derisive, the irony never barbed. Often he shows how divine humanity triumphs over mere asceticism, and with entire reverence; indeed, he might be described as an ascetic overflowing with humanity, just as he has been termed "a pagan, but a pagan constantly haunted by the pre-occupation of Christ." He is in turn—like his own Choulette in *The Red Lily*—saintly and Rabelaisian, yet without incongruity. At all times he is the unrelenting foe of superstition and hypocrisy. Of himself he once modestly said: "You will find in my writings perfect sincerity (lying demands a talent I do not possess), much indulgence, and some natural affection for the beautiful and good."

Whatever may be thought of the congruity of this combination of the saintly and the Rabelaisian in the realm of fiction, we are inclined to suggest that the effort to reconcile incompatibles has not had an illuminating effect upon M. Anatole's psychology when he comes to deal with a historical character such as that of Joan of Arc. As Mr. Andrew Lang has recently pointed out in a most searching but withal temperate criticism of M. France's alleged *chef d'œuvre*, his study of the figure of the Maid which is said to have occupied its author for nearly twenty years, proves on inspection to be little more than a blur. "The artist," Mr. Lang observes, "from the first pages of his Preface, appears to be perplexed; to hold no consistent view, to hold two contradictory views at once."¹

I cannot [he adds] accept M. France's portrait of her as a puzzle-headed, plucky, honest, dishonest, good-hearted, perpetually hallucinated lass, who "always in prayer, always in ecstasy, never observed the enemy."²

¹ "The *Chef d'œuvre* of M. Anatole France," in the *Fortnightly Review*, June, 1908.

² *Ibid.* p. 984.

So absolutely irreconcilable are the presentments of the character of the Maid with which M. France identifies himself at different stages of his narrative, that the reader who has nothing before him but Mr. Lang's article, will probably believe the English critic to be unconsciously misrepresenting the text upon which he is commenting. Thus, after referring us to an important passage in the Preface, in which the author says :

I have raised no doubt concerning the sincerity of Jeanne. No man can suspect her of lying ; she firmly believed that she received her mission from her Voices,

Mr. Lang goes on to point out how utterly inconsistent with this is the account which M. France gives of the scene at Loches, when Messire Christophe d'Harcourt seemed to show some incredulity as to the reality of Jeanne's mission. M. France, as Mr. Lang translates him, writes in reference to this episode : "The nobles present were struck by the heavenly expression of the girl. None the less, those eyes bathed in tears," (an interesting addition by M. France to the evidence he is professing to quote) "that ravished air was not an ecstasy : it was a sham ecstasy." As a further illustration, Mr. Lang also quotes another reference to this incident in the Preface, where the writer states that the same deposition of Dunois "would lead us to believe that the young peasant girl was a clever impostor, and gave at the request of the nobles an exhibition of an ecstasy, like the Esther of the regretted Dr. Luys."

Mr. Lang, as so often happens in magazine articles, was possibly hampered by the need of extreme compression.¹ His own concluding remarks suggest that he had much more to say than room to say it in. The result has been that the casual reader might easily go off with the idea that the English critic was pressing a point unduly against M. France, and that the latter meant no more than that all ecstasies were hallucinations, *i.e.*, visions dissociated from external reality. But when one comes to look up the text of M. France, one finds that the inconsistencies complained of are even more flagrant than Mr. Lang has led us to suppose. In the first place, in the body of his work M. France's language is such, as

¹ We may also notice that Mr Lang, having several times written on the subject, has probably dealt succinctly here with a point which has developed more at length in other articles.

fully to justify the translation "sham ecstasy." He says, without a word of qualification, "Ce n'était pas une extase, c'était l'imitation d'une extase." And he goes on, "scène à la fois pleine d'*artifice* et de *naïveté*," &c. There can be no possible doubt that M. France means, or at least did mean when he wrote that passage, that Jeanne shammed a trance in order to work upon the feelings of the King and his counsellors. Where the *naïveté* comes in is not so plain. Possibly M. France would regard a child who, knowing by experience the power of importunity, sets to work to howl its loudest when refused a second slice of cake, as only *naïf*, but that is a matter upon which opinions will differ. If Jeanne was the sort of person who had "sham ecstasies" in the sense that she contrived to look entranced and to shed tears at command, whenever it served her purpose, we have no hesitation in saying that she deserved to be whipped, and that Pierre Cauchon is one of the most unjustly maligned characters in history.

What is not less curious is the fact that in the Preface, which we may assume to have been written after the text of the work was completed, M. France distinctly implies¹ that the deposition of Dunois, as we have it, must have been doctored or mistranslated, precisely because it would lead us to believe that Jeanne comported herself like an impostor who called up sham ecstasies at will.

But most astounding of all, we find when we actually turn to the text of Dunois, who is the only authority for this incident, that there is not a word which can afford even a reasonable pretext for supposing that the Maid showed any of the outward symptoms of a trance either real, or feigned. The account given by Dunois is absolutely natural and almost proves its truth by its perfect simplicity and verisimilitude. Here is the passage:

At Loches, after the raising of the siege of Orleans, I remember that, one day, the King being in his private room with the Sieur Christopher d'Harcourt, the Bishop of Castres, his Confessor, and the Sieur de Trèves, who was formerly Chancellor of France, Jeanne and I went to seek him. Before entering, she knocked at the door: as soon as she had entered, she knelt before the King, and embracing his knees, said these words: "Noble Dauphin! hold no longer these many and long councils, but come quickly to Rheims to take the crown which befits you." "Is it your Counsel who told you this?" said Christopher

¹ Vol. I. p. xxiii.

d'Harcourt. "Yes," she answered, "and my Counsel urges me to this most of all." "Will you not say, here, in the presence of the King," added the Bishop, "what manner of Counsel it is which thus speaks to you?" "I think I understand," she said, colouring, "what you want to know, and I will tell you willingly." Then said the King: "Jeanne, do you mind saying what has been asked of you before the persons who are here present?" "No, Sire," she answered. And then she said this, or something approaching it: "When I am vexed that faith is not readily placed in what I wish to say in God's name, I retire alone and pray to God. I complain to Him that those whom I address do not believe me more readily, and my prayer ended, I hear a Voice which says to me: 'Daughter of God! go on! go on! go on! I will be thy Help: go on!' And when I hear this Voice, I have great joy. I would I could always be in that state." And in repeating to us this language of her Voice, she—strange to say—exulted marvellously, raising her eyes to heaven.¹

It is when we compare this perfectly straightforward and intelligible account of Dunois, who is the sole authority for the incident, with M. France's unequivocal charge that Jeanne at Loches treated the King to the spectacle of a sham ecstasy, that one begins to conceive a suspicion, a vehement suspicion, that the eminent Academician's practice in writing history is not in all respects in accord with the theories of his temperate and illuminating Preface. M. France, discoursing upon the duties of the historian, abounds in admirable professions. His strenuous search after truth has already been alluded to, but his own text is more precise than the translation of it given above.

J'ai écrit cette histoire avec un zèle ardent et tranquille; j'ai cherché la vérité sans mollesse, je l'ai rencontrée sans peur. Alors même qu'elle prenait un visage étrange, je ne me suis pas détourné d'elle. On me reprochera mon audace jusqu'à ce qu'on me reproche ma timidité.²

Again, he tells us that the documents relating to the Maid are all in various ways open to doubt and provocative of discussion, but he declares that "by making a prudent and

¹ I have borrowed here the translation of Mr. J. Douglas Murray, in his excellent *Jeanne d'Arc*, 2nd Edit., 1907, Heinemann, but I have made one or two slight changes, particularly in the last line, where Mr. Murray renders, "she was in a marvellous rapture." This, it seems to me, goes further than the Latin, in which there is absolutely nothing to suggest a trance of any kind. "Et, quod fortius est, recitando hujusmodi verba suarum vocum, ipsa miro modo exultabat, levando suos oculos ad coelum." The word *exultabat* conveys nothing more than the glow of enthusiasm.

² Vol. I. Preface, p. lxxxi.

judicious use of these texts" sufficient data can be obtained for a matter-of-fact narrative of some amplitude. "Moreover," he adds, "I have always given references to my sources; everyone may judge for himself of the authority of the evidence to which I appeal."¹

All this is very admirable, but we must frankly say that the results of confronting M. France's narrative with his sources, an enterprize which we have embarked upon, largely under the guidance of Mr. Lang's articles, have led us to the conclusion that among all the Lives of Jeanne d'Arc of Catholic sympathies, there is not one, not even the vast and much-abused work of Père Ayroles, which is more uncompromisingly partisan in its presentment of the subject than the "*chef d'œuvre*" of this candid searcher after truth. The quality of judiciousness we do not deny to M. France. He is very discreet. He is far from making the mistake of irritating the reader, more particularly the less erudite reader, by the appearance of anything like a dead set against his heroine. Besides he has to sell his book—"j'ai voulu être lu," he says himself with engaging frankness²—and to secure a large public, the element of picturesqueness is indispensable. It would have been very bad policy in an author to cut himself adrift from the romantic interest which Joan of Arc inspires in almost every Frenchman, however anti-clerical, an interest only comparable with the sympathy so generally felt north of the Tweed, for that much less worthy popular heroine, Mary Queen of Scots. Beyond question, M. France has written an interesting book, but if it had not been for the readiness which he shows to do justice to the Maid's courage, loyalty, and piety, his pages could hardly have failed to be dull even when they were not exasperating. But beyond such measure of justice to Jeanne as was recommended to M. France by his intimate knowledge of his French public, and by his own sound literary taste, we can find nothing but indications of a persistent attempt to disparage and belittle that religious or mystical aspect of her work which, after all, is the one thing which really gives her an unique position in history. Any one who does carefully compare M. France's narrative with his sources will discover that over and over again the evidence is strained to support conclusions for which there is absolutely no warrant, and always the bias takes the same tone hostile to the Maid. What is perhaps an even surer mark of the *Tendenzschrift* in the case of a writer of

¹ Vol. I. Preface, lxxx.

² Preface, p. lxxx.

M. Anatole France's experience and high sense of literary form, is the insistence upon certain ideas, the determination, even at the risk of tiresome iteration, to give prominence to some subordinate point. A remarkable example of this is the use made by M. France of a legendary incident which has absolutely nothing to do with the story of the Maid, and which is supposed to have occurred fifty years before she was born. A peasant of Champagne, before the Battle of Poitiers, is stated to have heard a voice which warned him to go and tell the King of France not to give battle to his enemies.¹ The King disregarded the advice, and was disastrously routed and taken prisoner. Finding something about not giving battle to the English in the first interview of Jeanne with Baudricourt, M. France persists in regarding the mission of Jeanne as a mere echo and replica of that of the peasant of Champagne. Now while it is natural enough that M. France, from his point of view, should give prominence to such elements of similarity—they are altogether of the slightest—as exist between the legend of the peasant of Champagne and the mission of Jeanne, it is surely highly significant of the writer's *parti pris* that we find this episode insisted upon almost as if it were the keynote of Jeanne's history. Twice over does M. France recount the story of the peasant of Champagne, while also referring to it in the Preface,² and, if I am not mistaken, in his second volume as well. But what is more serious, it is introduced on both occasions with an impressive statement which is, to say the very least, ridiculously exaggerated. Coming before Robert de Baudricourt, at Vaucouleurs, the Maid, according to M. France, "repeated word for word"—(*elle répétait mot pour mot*)—the warning formerly addressed to King John by the peasant of Champagne. We can only reply that she did nothing of the sort. The one witness who can in any way be quoted in this sense, viz., Bertrand de Poulangey, merely says:

I saw her speaking to the Captain, Robert de Baudricourt. She told him that she came to him in the name of her Lord, that the Dauphin must be told to be on his guard, and not to give battle to his enemies,³ because her Lord would send him succour before the middle

¹ In the Preface (p. xxii.) to the *Chronique des quatre Premiers Valois*, M. Siméon Luce fully admits that the whole story is a mere fabrication invented after the disaster to save French *amour propre* by representing the defeat as a chastisement for neglecting a heavenly warning.

² France, Vol. I. Preface, p. xxxvi.; pp. 71, 72; pp. 188, 189.

³ It is curious that both the French translation of the *Procès de Rehabilitation*, by Joseph Fabre, i. p. 131, and the English translation, by T. Douglas Murray, p. 225,

of Lent, that the kingdom belonged not to him, the Dauphin, but to her Lord; that her Lord would have the Dauphin King, and hold the kingdom in trust; that she would make him King in spite of his enemies, and would conduct him to his coronation.¹

How M. France can say that this is word for word the same message as that of the peasant of Champagne altogether passes our comprehension. The latter's warning is confined to the simple words "*Va au roy Jehan de France et lui di qu'il ne combatte ses ennemis.*"² If we can trust Bertrand de Poulangey, Jeanne did declare to Baudricourt that Charles' commanders ought not to give battle to the English for the present, but out of several matters which she communicated to him this was the one which made least impression (only Bertrand mentions it) and which, so far as we can see, bore no practical fruit of any kind. The time at which the interview took place is really quite uncertain,³ and the circumstances of Jeanne's warning to Baudricourt and those of the peasant of Champagne's coming to King John are as different as they can possibly be. Jeanne was a real person, the peasant never existed. On the other hand, we cannot find a fragment of evidence for M. France's statement that this same message was afterwards communicated to the King and to her examiners, and M. France, though he professes to give all his sources, strangely omits to quote any in this matter to which he himself gives so much prominence. He calmly declares, page 188, just as previously on page 72 :

Devant ces gens d'Eglise, de même qu' à Vaucouleurs devant sire Robert, elle répétait mot pour mot, ce qu' autrefois avait dit le vavasseur de Champagne envoyé au roi Jean le Bon, tout comme elle était envoyée au dauphin Charles.

Such a sentence throws an interesting light on M. France's claim to be the representative of rigorous historical methods. In the first place we have not, after long search, been able to find the faintest justification for the main statement that Jeanne said anything to the clergy about not giving battle to the English. Secondly, the statement that the messages were word

make Baudricourt say the exact contrary, viz., that the Dauphin must not cease giving battle. But the Latin will not bear that interpretation.

¹ *Procès*, II. 456.

² *Quatre Premiers Valois*, p. 47.

³ We are strongly inclined to believe (and M. Petit Dutaillis, in Lavis's *Histoire de France*, is of the same opinion) that Mr. Lowell is right in regarding the date "about Ascension Day 1428" as a misreading. If the real date was the beginning of 1429, Joan may well have had some premonition as to the disaster which ensued in the Battle of Herrings. Some other incidents bear this out.

for word the same is absurd on the face of it. Thirdly, it is almost grotesque to find the sceptical M. France consistently treating the message of the peasant to King John as if it were a historical fact. Hardly any one of those Catholic miracles which he scoffs at is so badly authenticated as the supposed episode of the Vavasseur of Champagne.

Unfortunately, M. France's numberless inaccuracies of the same kind are almost safe from hostile comment, at any rate so far as the general reading public are concerned, simply because it is impossible to catalogue blunders dealing with names, dates, and references, in any way which commands the attention of readers at large. One can only give a few specimens and refer those who are interested to the more copious collections made by Mr. Andrew Lang in his various articles on the subject. Naturally it is only the specialist who cares for these out-of-the-way details.

As we have already pointed out, the most significant feature in this lax interpretation of the historian's responsibilities is that all the inaccuracies and all the straining of evidence invariably tend in one direction. M. France is convinced, and would fain persuade his readers, that Jeanne had from the very first been the puppet of the clergy, that she was a person perpetually hallucinated, that her military capacity was nil, and that consequently she counted for nothing in the more serious deliberations of the Armagnac chiefs, that she was utilized as a kind of talisman, or *porte bonheur*,¹ ensuring success for the side on which she fought, that she was only the most sincere and respectable among a crowd of rival prophetesses, that her prophecies were in fact not unfrequently falsified, in a word, that she has been so entirely embowered in legend that the traditional presentment of her is distorted with every kind of superstitious belief. It must be clear that many of these things are extremely hard to refute. We can only show, and Mr. Lang has already conclusively shown, that the evidence quoted in support of this or that statement altogether fails to establish what is alleged. We might take for example the contention that Jeanne had been coached in her part by certain priests, who were really the organizers of the whole movement. There is literally not a vestige of proof for this. We are left to a chain of inferences and to assumptions based upon the slenderest thread of fact, while all the plain statements

¹ This M. France repeats frequently; see for example II. p. 168.

made by Jeanne herself, whose veracity is not disputed, tell overwhelmingly the other way. There is evidence, for example, that Jeanne, while still at Domremy, in 1428 or 1429, knew of some prophecy which said that "France was to be ruined by a woman and restored by a maid from the marches of Lorraine." Now this last clause, M. France argues, could not possibly have occurred in any sort of folk-story which was likely to be familiar to the peasants of Domremy, consequently it must have been put into her head by some priest. But surely the very fact which MM. France, Siméon Luce, and others are perpetually insisting on, that Jeanne was but one of a class of visionaries, such as the peasant of Champagne already spoken of, renders it almost certain that there must have been scores of such sayings in circulation, of which probably not one in fifty has left any trace of itself in our records.

It is precisely among the peasantry that these prophetic utterances take root. We find them at all periods. In Elizabeth's day, for instance, as we learn on Bacon's authority, a rhyme was current,

When HEMPE in spunne
England's done,

in which the letters HEMPE were supposed to indicate Henry, Edward, Mary, Philip, and Elizabeth. Clearly if Jeanne was capable of learning such a saying and repeating it to others after a priest had spoken to her about it, she was equally capable of learning it from one of her fellow-villagers. Admitting even M. France's theory of some priest who deliberately concocted it, why should we conclude that Jeanne was the first upon whom he tried it? But the whole discussion is absurd, for in point of fact, as Mr. Lang has pointed out, Katherine Royer, Jeanne's hostess, deposed that she had heard Jeanne say:

"Have you not heard of the prophecy that France is to be ruined by a woman, and restored by a maid from the marches of Lorraine?" *And then this witness remembered having heard that saying and was amazed.*

It is almost incredible that M. France should quote, or at least give a reference to, this very passage, and immediately after declare that the peasantry knew nothing about the prophecy.

Equally ridiculous is the attempt to prove clerical influence from some words of Jeanne in which she is supposed to have

spoken of a King holding his sovereignty from God *in commendam*. The fact is, we have not the slightest reason to believe that the stilted Latin into which the officers of the Court translated the depositions represents, with any degree of accuracy, the vernacular idiom in which the witnesses gave their evidence. The conception in itself, apart from its technical name, was one that was likely to be perfectly familiar. On the other hand we have Jeanne's explicit statement, confirmed by indirect evidence from other sources, that she said nothing of her visions to any man, priest or not, but only to the King.¹ It would be contrary to all sound principles of historical method to brush this plain and definite statement aside, and to urge with M. France that the priests exploited "her gift of seeing things invisible to the common run of Christians." There is, we repeat, not a scrap of direct evidence or even plausible inference, to suggest that Jeanne in her early years was the puppet of the clergy.

But the more carefully one studies M. France's historical work the more clearly he shows himself incapable of presenting the evidence fairly. He is positively ingenious in jumbling up worthless records with those of unimpeachable authority, whenever, for example, there is question of the Maid's prophecies. Those that are genuine and remarkable by their fulfilment he slurs over;² those that are plainly bogus utterances he displays with equal prominence, contenting himself, it may be, with a word of caution in a footnote, which not one reader in ten will pay any attention to.

Throughout there is a certain tone of raillery, and often rather more than the suspicion of a sneer, in M. France's allusions to religious topics. He so introduces the subject of the Voices as always to suggest a certain contemptuous or pitying attitude of mind which he never allows the reader to forget. The note is struck from the very beginning when he persists in telling us exactly in what guise Jeanne saw St. Michael, although he knows and attests that she absolutely refused to answer any questions on the subject. Thus he writes :

She saw St. Michael sometimes by some pillar of a church or a chapel, in the guise of a fair knight, with coroneted helm, shield and coat of arms, piercing the demon with his lance. . . . She knew the angel by his arms, his courtesy, and his noble maxims.

¹ Quicherat, *Procès*, I. pp. 128, 129.

² See Mr. Lang in *Fortnightly Review*, June, 1908, pp. 988—990.

Towards the end of his second volume, almost as if he had by that time seen some of the criticisms that have been directed against this confident interpretation of Jeanne's mystic experiences, he embarks upon a sort of vindication of this view. Recalling that the Maid, being vehemently pressed in one of her later examinations declared that St. Michael had the appearance of a *très vrai prudhomme*. M. France comments :

It would be a very false idea of Jeanne to suppose that she saw the Archangel in the long gown of a doctor or in a cope of cloth of gold. Besides, that was not the guise in which he was represented in churches. He was portrayed both in painting and sculpture, clothed in shining armour and wearing a helmet encircled with a coronet of gold. So he appeared to her "in the form of a very true *prudhomme*" understanding the word as in the *Chanson de Roland*, where we read of a mighty sword stroke that it was a *coup de prudhomme*. He came to her attired as a knight (*en habit de preux*) like Arthur and Charlemagne, fully armed.

It may seem rather a bold thing to differ with a member of the *Académie Française* upon the interpretation of his own language, but we confess that this very vindication strikes us as a characteristic example of M. France's practice of reading his own ideas into the documents before him, regardless of the text.

M. France prefaces the passage we have just quoted by saying :

She had *up to this* evinced a great repugnance to describe the face and dress of the Angel and the Saints who had come to visit her in her village. Master John de la Fontaine endeavoured to elicit something more definite on this head :

"Under what form and appearance, size, and dress does St. Michael show himself to you?"

"He is in the form of a *très vrai prudhomme*."¹

Clearly, M. France means to convey that this answer of Jeanne's amounted to a going back upon her former reticence, and that the Maid, by what she said, admitted that she saw him as a knight.

But why does M. France omit the rest of Jeanne's answer?

"He was in the form of a *très vrai prud'homme*; as for his dress and the other things, I shall say nothing more. With regard to the angels, I have seen them with my eyes, and you shall learn nothing more from me on this subject."

¹ Vol. II. pp. 320, 321.

It is clear that Jeanne had no idea of giving any information as to the appearance and dress of her heavenly visitants; and any one who will look up the long article in Godefroy's great dictionary¹ of old French will perceive that the term *prud'homme* from the thirteenth century onwards refers only to moral and not to physical or external characteristics. Godefroy renders it *homme probe et sage*, just as *preude femme* is *femme probe et sage*. The editor justifies this interpretation by no less than thirty-eight quotations, not one of which lends the slightest countenance to the military idea suggested by M. France. Indeed, M. France need only have looked up some of his own references to see this,² but the following passage of Joinville is unmistakable.

The great king Philip when he was told that Count John of Chalons had a son . . . replied that he prayed God to make him a *prud'homme* like the duke whose name he bore. They asked him why he had not said *preu homme*, and he answered, "Because there is a great difference between *preu homme* and *prud'homme*, for there is many a *preu homme* knight in the lands both of Christians and Saracens who never believed in God or His Mother. Wherefore I say to you," he continued, "that God vouchsafes a great boon and grace to the Christian knight, whom He permits to be valiant in body, and whom He suffers to remain in His service by preserving him from deadly sin. Whoso thus rules himself, deserves to be called *prud'homme* because this prowess comes to him from God's bounteousness. While those of whom I spoke just now may be called *preux hommes*, because they are valiant in body but do not fear either God or sin."³

But clearly this point is a matter of very minor importance as compared with the much more serious misrepresentations which meet us at every turn in M. Anatole France's two volumes. The astounding thing is that among his own countrymen, the erudite who are not clericals take M. France quite seriously and talk freely of his "*parfaite science des textes*," and the "*sûreté avec laquelle il les interprète et les manie*."⁴

HERBERT THURSTON.

¹ Godefroy, *Dictionnaire de l'ancienne langue française*, Vol. VI., pp. 398-400.

² The peasant of Champagne who came to King John to warn him about Poitiers is described as *très prud'homme*; and in the *Journal d'un Bourgeois de Paris*, under 1440, an incident is recounted which shows that a *prud'homme* was a civilian, a citizen, as opposed to *soldats*, the military.

³ Joinville, *Saint Louis*, cap. xii.

⁴ *Revue du Mois*, 1908, Mai 10, p. 596.

A Study in Bigotry.

As Prejudice is the rejection of reason altogether, so Bigotry is the imposition of private reason,—that is, of our own views and theories, of our own First Principles, as if they were the absolute truth, and the standard of all argument, investigation and judgment. If there are any men in the world who ought to abstain from Bigotry, it is Protestants. They, whose very badge is the right of private judgment, should give as well as take, should allow others what they claim themselves. . . . Bigotry is the infliction of our own unproved First Principles on others, and the treating others with scorn and hatred for not accepting them.

Newman in *The Present Position of Catholics*, "Assumed Principles the Intellectual Ground of the Protestant View," p. 292.

THAT champion of militant Protestantism, Mr. R. F. Horton, M.A., D.D., Minister of the Congregational Church, Hampstead, has long been prominent among the misguided assailants of Catholicity in this country, and readers of *THE MONTH* have had, from time to time, their attention directed to his aims and his tactics.¹ But his response, hitherto, to criticism and correction has left little hope, humanly speaking, of his ever learning what Catholicism really is, and so it is not primarily on his account that we propose to deal with some of the anti-Catholic passages in his latest book,² but because they furnish a convenient text for the study of that sad abuse of human reason and perversion of Christian zeal, called Bigotry. *My Belief* is not a formal anti-Catholic tractate: its immediate aim is constructive. It is a sort of Protestant *Apologia*, addressed in the first instance to the doubter and the unbeliever, and giving an account of the author's faith, its extent and its groundwork. However, in its three hundred odd pages, the book includes incidentally a good many attacks on the Church. If the benighted Papists are beyond the reach of the Doctor's logic, they can serve at least to furnish "awful examples," to point sundry morals, to act as foils to the lustre of the untarnished truth. If the infidel will not become a Hortonite, he shall at

¹ See, especially, *The Methods of a Protestant Controversialist*, by Mr. James Britten, in *THE MONTH* for November, 1898, since reprinted as a Catholic Truth Society pamphlet.

² *My Belief: Answers to Certain Religious Difficulties*. Clarke and Co.

any rate not turn Romanist. The many olive-branches held out to the Theosophist, the Unitarian, and the Agnostic are not meant to conceal the cudgel ready for the Catholic. Now we are not going to call in question the writer's sincerity in all this : to imagine him in bad faith would be to impute to him a degree of wickedness quite incredible in face of his known character and repute, and the zeal he displays for the faith that is in him. No doubt he is persecuting, as Saul did, the Church of God, but he may plead Saul's excuse—*ignorans feci*—for certainly much of the Catholicism he condemns bears little resemblance to the Catholicism we profess, and he generally misunderstands what he manages to state correctly. Saul was a bigot and a persecutor because he took for granted, inculpably, it may be, but still without warrant, the absolute truth of his "paternal traditions." Dr. Horton, we fear, merits the like reproach, because of his similar attitude towards the great Protestant Tradition as to the nature of Catholicity. His book, then, has two aspects: the one, explanatory of the changed relations of Protestantism to the religious problems of our day, the other, indicative of its unalterable hostility to the Church. In the first, we see how, in face of modern difficulties, the claims of Protestantism to be a revealed religion are being gradually abandoned; in the other, we realize that the old bitter spirit is still living and energetic. In the sense of Newman's definition, quoted above, this spirit is pure and simple Bigotry, and it is to its expression in the pages of *My Belief* that we propose to devote some attention.

No one can deal with the question of Protestant Bigotry without recalling to mind the famous *Lectures on the Present Position of Catholics in England*, delivered by Dr. Newman in Birmingham more than half a century ago. They are living and actual to-day. Nowhere before or since, we venture to say, has the Protestant position been subjected to such keen and penetrating analysis; nowhere has it met with so complete and crushing an exposure. In these brilliant pages, the humour, irony, and pathos of the great writer, his logical acumen, his sustained eloquence, his variety of style, appear to the best advantage, and we are grateful to Dr. Horton for giving us occasion to re-peruse them.¹ As to their actuality—we were

¹ They should be read by every Catholic who feels puzzled and, perhaps, dismayed, at seeing in this country so much zeal and learning arrayed against the Church. The Catholic Truth Society edition at 1s., with Introduction by Canon Barry, is both cheap and well-printed.

tempted to call this article *Dr. Newman on Dr. Horton*, so aptly does *My Belief* illustrate (in its anti-Catholic passages) the thesis of the *Lectures*. Did space permit we could easily find chapter and verse therein to substantiate the eight propositions established by Newman, showing the nature of the Protestant view, how it is sustained by Tradition and based upon Fable, how it finds True Testimony insufficient, is inconsistent in Logic, is vitalized by Prejudice, is grounded on Assumed Principles, and finally, protected by Ignorance. The question before us, as before Newman in 1851, is to inquire

why it is that in this intelligent nation, and in this rational [twentieth] century, we Catholics are so despised and hated by [certain of] our own countrymen, with whom we have lived all our lives, that they are prompt to believe any story, however extravagant, that is told to our disadvantage; as if beyond doubt we were, every one of us, either brutishly deluded or preternaturally hypocritical, and they themselves, on the contrary, were in comparison of us absolute specimens of sagacity, wisdom, uprightness, manly virtue and enlightened Christianity.¹

At the same time, we are not confronted, as Newman was, with a united and practically homogeneous Protestant nation. A better knowledge of Catholicism on the one hand and, we fear, the growth of religious indifference² on the other, have combined to limit the range of the above problem. The "disciples of the Elizabethan tradition," in so far as they are active in its maintenance, are now a comparatively small body, found chiefly among the sects of Nonconformity. But, thus concentrated, the spirit of that Tradition is no less bitter and intolerant than before, for it draws its life from the same evil root—human pride. And so the position of Catholics which was "present" in 1851 is "present" still, and the question, then so admirably dealt with, has a living interest to-day. Let us, then, examine the workings of that spirit in the volume before us, if only in order to be the better able, should occasion offer, to exorcise it from the minds of its victims. Such will never be an easy task when the virus has early entered the blood and been constantly fed by further inoculations, for the worst and strangest feature of such cases is that the patients are not conscious of their ailment: on the contrary, they often make profession of calm

¹ *Present Position*: "Protestant View of the Catholic Church," p. 1.

² Dr. Horton asserts (*My Belief*, p. 12), and we wish we could dispute his assertion, that the vast bulk of the people of this country are indifferent to religion.

judgment, charitable interpretation, wide tolerance, sober assertion—qualities belied by their every utterance. No other diagnosis can explain the presence in a book, which contains some of the wildest and most outrageous accusations against the Church we have ever met, of the following naïve declarations:

The old polemic against Catholicism is out of date; the methods and the tone of it are unsuitable to the modern world. If we are to be Protestants, we must be Protestants of a new type; we must understand the position better. Our antagonism to Rome must be *more respectful, more sympathetic*, and for that reason more firm and more uncompromising.¹

We hold no brief to disparage *any creed or view* genuinely held by man.²

What Christians are divided upon, that we should hold with *modesty and deference*, considering that no truth of God is of private interpretation, and that no private view is the foundation of a world-religion.³

There we have the Doctor's professions. *He* is not an old type Protestant; he disparages no man's genuine creed; he views even Rome with respect and sympathy; he is modest in advancing his own private opinions, knowing that they are not infallible. Let us now look at his practice. His thesis throughout, but especially in the chapter on "The Claims of Rome," is that Catholicism is not merely *not* Christianity, but that it is anti-Christianity. He speaks of "that bastard imperialism masquerading as the Church of Christ."⁴ "England saw," he says, speaking of Mary's reign, "that the Roman system is not Christian but anti-Christian."⁵ Again, "Either the Roman Church is true, the voice of God on earth, or it is a blasphemous delusion. The logical alternative here is—Christ or Anti-Christ,"⁶ an issue rather strongly stated, in which, of course, Dr. Horton takes the latter view. "There is *no exaggeration*," he exclaims once more, "in saying that spiritually, religiously, as a force in the individual life, and as the moulding influence of society, Christianity is the antithesis of Catholicism."⁷

Now let us here remark that so far from Dr. Horton having brought his polemic up-to-date (to say nothing about "respect" and "sympathy") he is merely echoing an age-long taunt

¹ P. 16. Here, as elsewhere in these extracts, unless otherwise stated, the italics are ours.

² P. 75.

³ P. 217.

⁴ P. 178.

⁵ *Ibid.*

⁶ P. 80.

⁷ P. 85.

against the Church, which has done duty in Protestant controversy ever since it took shape in the rebel heart of Luther. Newman has admirably summed up its nature and genesis :

It was thus a thought of genius, and as I think preternatural genius, to pitch upon the expedient which has been used against the Church from Christ's age to our own ; to call her, as in the first century, Beelzebub, so in the sixteenth [and in the twentieth] Anti-Christ ; it was a bold, politic and successful move. It startled men who heard ; and whereas Anti-Christ by the very notion of his character, will counterfeit Christ, he will therefore be, so far, necessarily like Him ; and if Anti-Christ is like Christ, then Christ, I suppose, must be like Anti-Christ : thus there was, even at first starting, a felicitous plausibility about the very charge which went far towards securing belief, while it commanded attention.¹

This (literally) diabolical device, therefore, of ascribing to Satan the work of Christ is still in active use. Of course, Dr. Horton will not agree with this view of its origin. He is quite confident that his proposition—Rome is Anti-Christ—can be proved by an appeal to history, and to history he accordingly goes in the following fashion :

And still more if the Roman claim is to be allowed, if John XXIII., Alexander VI., Julius II., were the divinely-appointed vicegerents of God on the earth, if the corruption and cruelty and obscurantism of the Curia were the expression of the Holy Spirit's work, if the sordid superstitions, the confessional, the pantheon of Virgin and saints, the degraded priesthood and the blind dogmatism which characterize modern Romanism were to be identified with Christianity, no *thoughtful* man would venture to assert the supremacy of that religion. As the weary nations, France and Italy, with untold labour shake themselves free from the destroying tyranny, escaping ruined and degraded from the yoke, they are in no mood to accept a Christianity which, in their eyes, is Catholicism.²

Now, for the large number of students and thinkers who know the history of the Latin Church, and observe the workings of that powerful organization in the Catholic countries, Ireland, South America, Spain, Portugal and Belgium, one point is practically settled : If Catholicism is Christianity, the world must deliver itself from Christianity. The manhood of France and Italy has settled that question. The disastrous effect of the priesthood and the confessional, on the woman and the home : the intellectual obscurantism [and so on and so forth : see previous catalogue] have convinced *thoughtful* people of one thing at any rate : if this is Christ's intention, if the Papacy represents Him, if

¹ *Present Position* : "Prejudice the Life of the Protestant View," p. 224.

² Pp. 61, 62.

Catholicism as it is known to us in history, is the best that Christianity has to offer, the world which is bent on liberty, light and truth must consent to let the dream of Christianity die.¹

The "history" in these largely hypothetical indictments is somewhat "hustled," and, rather than try to keep pace with it, we are content to allow the Doctor to think we cannot. His position might have been put much more shortly thus: if the "Protestant Alliance" reading of historical facts is correct, then Rome is wrong—a proposition which, we hope, is self-evident. Less keen-sighted observers than the Doctor may possibly think that the only tyranny that those "weary nations, France and Italy" as represented by their Governments, are trying to shake off, is that of the Ten Commandments. But notice what Dr. Horton's proofs amount to. He reckons, by the rhetorical device known as Mere Assertion, all thoughtful people on his side, but in reality all that he gives us is *his* impressions of Catholic doctrine, *his* ideas of the effects of Catholic practices, *his* views of the state of Catholic countries, *his* interpretation of the facts of Catholic history, and, finally, *his* selection of corroborative testimony. So that it comes to this—we must either disbelieve *My Belief*, or reject Catholicism. Painful as the alternative is, we cannot hesitate: Dr. Horton must go. He answers too exactly to Newman's inspired description:

Such a one cannot afford to be fair; he cannot be fair if he tries. He is ignorant, and he goes on to be unjust. He has always viewed things in one light, and he cannot adapt himself to any other; he cannot throw himself into the ideas of other men, fix upon the principles on which those ideas depend, and then set himself to ascertain how those principles differ, or whether they differ at all from those which he acts upon himself.²

So we are not much impressed by our author's indictment of Catholicism; we should as soon trust a blind man's impressions of a landscape. And like himself are the witnesses he calls. This respectful and sympathetic antagonist of Rome sends us for information about her life and character, not to any Catholic authority, but to such books as Conybeare's *Roman Catholicism as a Factor of European Politics*, Scherer's *What is Catholicism?* and Dearden's *Modern Romanism Examined*, the implication being that Catholics, if they have anything at all to say for themselves, either do not understand the workings of

¹ P. 80.

² *Present Position*: "Logical Inconsistency of the Protestant View," p. 178.

their own doctrines, or are in a conspiracy to misrepresent them—fools or knaves, the usual kind alternative.¹ Now, we are no admirers of Julian the Apostate, but he never, to our knowledge, compiled, for the edification of youthful unbelievers and perverts, a catena of passages from pagan writers and apologists describing Christianity. And yet it would have been so easy. From Tacitus, Suetonius, and Pliny, from Celsus, Autolycus, Cæcilius, and Porphyry, a picture could have been painted of the early Christians quite as lurid, and fully as trustworthy, as Dr. Horton's sketch of modern Catholics. "If Christianity is an *exitiabilis superstitio*," we can imagine the Emperor writing in his best rhetorical style "if Christians are inflamed with 'a hatred of the human race,' if they devour infants at their banquets, if they practise magic, if they worship the head of an ass, if Christ was a 'crucified sophist,' and Paul 'a conjurer and impostor,' then surely Christianity is unworthy of educated men, and will certainly be the destruction of the Empire." Julian might have written thus and quoted abundant authorities—magistrates, historians, philosophers, statesmen—but Julian, if he had done so, would not have been quite honest. The fellow-student of St. Gregory knew better. But Dr. Horton's honesty can only be saved by emphasizing his ignorance. It is, in truth, abysmal, because it embraces first principles. All that parade of "facts," which we have read, amounts to nothing, for the power of clear perception and right inference is denied him; his book is a perfect store-house of logical fallacies.

We have seen how widely astray bigotry leads Dr. Horton in his estimate of Catholicism as a system; of its effect on the inner life of the individual, he is just as incredibly and perversely ignorant. Here he has no "history" to guide him, but must proceed *à priori* or by generalizing from his necessarily limited and wholly external observation. Yet he never falters: no prophet could be surer of his message.

The clearer sense [as Newman says] we [Catholics] have of our own honesty, of the singleness of our motives, and the purity of

¹ Another "authority," on whom Dr. Horton seems to pin his faith, is Professor Gwatkins, of Cambridge, a scholar who in his Gifford Lectures at Edinburgh some years ago displayed such rancour against Catholicism as to move the indignation and disgust of a non-Catholic reviewer (see *The Journal of Theological Studies*, April, 1908, pp. 460, et seq.). Curiously enough, Professor Gwatkins also makes a profession of tolerance in the following singular terms: "It would ill become one, who has been the colleague of Lord Acton, to throw scorn on the Romish layman" (!) Yet by implication he does little else.

our aims—of the truth, the beauty, the power of our religion, its exhaustless fund of consolation for the weary, and its especial correspondence to the needs of the weak—so much the greater may well be our perplexity to find . . . that facts, and logic, and good sense, and right and virtue, are all supposed to lie in the opposite scale.¹

Dr. Horton, at any rate, is convinced that they do, and he advances his tenets with his wonted "modesty and deference." All through his book occur preposterous remarks like these :

For Catholics, and *those who mean by religion submission to authority without reasoning*, the Credal belief [in Christ's divinity] is enough. They accept the dogma readily, just as they believe, by a very similar act of intellectual humility, that the whale swallowed Jonah : *but the belief has no vital relation to them.*²

The effect of submission to [the Roman system] will be discernible in the decay of Catholic nations, and in the *deterioration of individuals*, who take the fraudulent authority as divine, and bow to it as they do to God.³

Men return to the Catholic fold, and have a sense of peace : the warfare is accomplished ; rest is reached. They do not notice, *what is obvious to the observer*, that they have surrendered ; they have not found truth but only renounced the search ; they have not escaped the responsibility of their reason in religion, but only seared and crushed it. The Roman Church has great attractions, if once the sense of truth and moral responsibility is surrendered.⁴

Of course there are Catholics who believe in the infallibility of the Church. . . . But . . . the belief is maintained not only without evidence, but in the teeth of evidence, *by the sheer exertion of credulity* which refuses to look at the facts.⁵

The power to shorten its duration [that of Purgatory] is claimed by the Pope and *sold for money or penance*. To call this irreligious is far too mild a term. It is substituting dreams of the madhouse for truths, and the result appears in the *tyrannical power* of the clergy, and the *degraded superstition* of the people.⁶

Nothing kills religion so quickly as a closed creed, or an *infallible authority*.⁷

In Catholic countries the appeal to reason is irrelevant ; and amongst ourselves there are many *women and effeminate men* to whom the sacrifice of reason is a positive delight.⁸

She [Rome] has led men to think that Christianity only proposes to save men from the punishment of their sins, and not from the sins themselves. The Roman method is to save men not from but in their sins. . . . It is the complete ignorance and denial of this truth [apparently, that the forgiveness of sin means return to Christ] in the

¹ *Present Position* : "Protestant View of the Catholic Church," p. 2.

² P. 95. ³ P. 79. ⁴ P. 86. ⁵ P. 113. ⁶ P. 165. ⁷ P. 29. ⁸ P. 106.

Roman Church, which renders that Church at once so attractive to sinful men *who desire to continue in sin*, and so destructive of Christianity, the whole object of which is to deliver men from their sins.¹

Thus far our sympathetic and respectful critic, who "holds no brief to disparage any creed or view genuinely held by men," nor, presumably, the men who hold them. We might fill pages with the like enlightened comment, but enough has been quoted to illustrate Newman's definition: "Bigotry is the infliction of our own unproved First Principles on others, and the treating others with scorn and hatred for not accepting them." For mark, Dr. Horton's argument is here mainly deductive. His assumed (and unproved) First Principle is that Catholicity is anti-Christian in teaching and practice, and from this he argues to the characters of those who profess it; to this he traces the decay of Catholic nations and the necessary deterioration of individuals. He is thus independent of facts, he can paint in bold outlines. Romanists are either knaves or fools, converts are men of weak character and feeble minds, ex-Catholics need no other recommendation for wisdom and probity and veracity than the fact that they have left the Church. It is useless to ask such a man how he manages to read the conscience, it is useless to point to Catholics of good life and high intelligence, to the saints and doctors and fine flower of our faith—these are strange exceptions, whose existence cannot invalidate logical inferences from absolute First Principles. So with his eyes tightly shut, Dr. Horton makes the astounding assertion that the Catholic's belief in Christ's divinity has no practical effect on his life! Where in the wide world if not in the Catholic Church has the conviction that Christ is very God a practical effect on conduct? Bigotry, we see, not only drives out charity but saps intelligence as well. By some strange and long-continued process Dr. Horton has persuaded himself that Catholicity is as manifestly wicked and mischievous as, say, the devil worship of some heathen tribe. A recognition of this fact will go far to explain his mental vagaries and help us to be patient with him. He knows no better, and as we should not blame a missionary for rapidly concluding that there was no good in devil-worship, and that those addicted to it need not be asked to justify it, and that, in view of the fact that they worship the devil, they were presumably guilty of other less grievous immoral practices,

¹ Pp. 272, 273.

so we may extend to Dr. Horton the charity he refuses to us, and say he is neither fool nor knave but the victim of a delusion. One might, indeed, as reasonably be angry with a gramophone, whose "record" was inscribed with the great Protestant Tradition in all its fulness—and foulness.¹

It is noteworthy, however, and consoling to us as emphasizing one of the Marks of the Church that the Doctor's bad language is reserved for Catholicity. Towards all other beliefs and misbeliefs he is nothing if not considerate. The real anti-Christians on the Continent are to him, as we have seen, "the manhood of France and Italy." He implies that a thinker, if candid, must regard Theosophy as a possible new Evangel.² He has a good word to say for Unitarianism: "A view which commends itself to a great thinker like Martineau and a great scholar like Harnack, men of undoubted Christian life and conduct, must be treated with respect."³ He is so reluctant to speak unkindly of Calvinism that he involves himself in a contradiction—"Calvinism *with all its strength and beauty*, is regarded, and regarded *justly*, as an evil dream."⁴ Again, "Judaism is only superior to other [contemporaneous] religions, owing to the receptivity of these gifted men [the Prophets]. Plato's religion, is loftier and nobler than any single Israelite's."⁵ Another sentence in the same page reveals the reason for that startling remark—"We do not venture now to say that Christianity is distinguished from other religions by the fact that it is revelation and they are not."⁶ Even the atheist Haeckel is praised by implication—"Haeckel has not perhaps as much influence in his own country as he has among our *enlightened and pure-living* working people."⁷ Must we not logically infer that the more enlightened and pure-living we are the more we shall come under the influence of Haeckel?⁸ Finally, apostates from the

¹ Cf. Newman's long and able description of the Prejudiced Man in *Present Position*: "Prejudice the Life of the Protestant View," pp. 243—249.

² P. 14. ³ P. 94. ⁴ P. 127. ⁵ P. 57.

⁶ Note in the same connection—"No Christian *with the modern temper* would venture to say that Christianity is the final revelation" (p. 60). It gives us an insight into the bearing of Modernist views to find that they are those of Dr. Horton.

⁷ P. 12.

⁸ The reader will have noticed how frequent is Dr. Horton's use of what Jeremy Taylor calls "question-begging appellatives." He is indeed a past master in the art of arguing by innuendo; he can (and does) make an epithet do duty for a treatise. But sometimes, as here, the habit plays him false. Elsewhere he states, "Thoughtful and intelligent Europe is now non-Christian" (p. 251), whence we must conclude that Christian Europe remains so only in virtue of its stupidity and want of reflection! There are many such instances of generalization gone mad.

faith have as we might have supposed a warm welcome from Dr Horton.

I confess [he cries] that if the evidence of the Divinity of Christ were [such as Rome presents], I should not for a moment believe: I should join the ranks of the *thoughtful and instructed men* who in Catholic countries have *sadly* renounced Catholicity.¹

A mind like this, we may readily suppose, falls an easy victim to stories which feed its bigotry and prejudice, and *My Belief* contains a number which suggest *My Credulity* as a fitter title. As those who deny all religion are often most given to superstition, so our author, who seeks to distinguish himself from mere Papists by asserting—"For my own part I believe only what seems to me certain,"² by a fitting nemesis lends easy credence to the silliest of anti-Catholic fables. He quotes, for instance, "from thousands" of its like the usual Evangelical tale of the "Catholic converted by reading the Bible." This particular "brand" was doing time in Durham gaol for attempted murder. Providence, we may conjecture, brought it about that he should enter himself as a Protestant, though his immediate object was to gain "certain supposed advantages," attached to that profession. Thus he came across a New Testament, and one day, when reading it, it occurred to him: "If this book is true, the priest is not. *I can pray to God myself.*" So he knelt and asked for forgiveness and in time became a preacher and is now a missionary in India.³ We presume that Dr. Horton accepted this tale, as he gives no other evidence, on the grounds of its intrinsic verisimilitude, it being the well-known custom of priests to forbid all direct intercourse with God! Another equally well-established doctrine of Rome, viz., that heresy should be repressed by force and all heretics, as far as is possible and politic, exterminated, is illustrated by an incredibly fatuous legend of the "Maria Monk" class. He prepares the ground by an *ex parte*, imperfect and thoroughly unfair statement of Catholic teaching in regard to the right of the Church, as a divine society, to punish her rebellious subjects, quoting Padre Marianus de Luca, who, our readers will remember, figured largely in that *cause célèbre*, "Vaughan v. The Rock."⁴ As

¹ P. 96.

² See Preface.

³ *My Belief*, pp. 119, 120.

⁴ See C.T.S. pamphlet, with that title.

the teaching of the Roman theologian was then explained to the satisfaction of a British jury, we need not refer to it further, except perhaps to recall, as Father Vaughan did, Cardinal Manning's declaration that since the disappearance of a united Christendom, persecution for those who hold religious opinions different from ours would itself be a crime and a heresy. We have little hesitation in saying that if what Dr. Horton would call "the spirit of Torquemada" is alive to-day, it is to be found in those like himself, who applaud the persecuting French Government, and who here in England would penalize Catholic education on the ground that this is a Protestant country. But let us come to the story which is supposed to justify Dr. Horton's piece of fanatical bluster—"The Roman Church therefore claims the right to torture, burn and kill all who will not accept her doctrine."¹

It will be said [he exclaims] that in the modern world there is no danger of Rome ever exercising her right of putting heretics to death. Well, I have before me an article which appeared in *France et Évangile* of January, 1905, on "La Curie Romaine." The writer is M. du Belloy, who was present as a secretary at the Vatican Council of 1870. He gives an account of the working of the Congregation of the Inquisition to-day. It employed in 1870, two hundred thousand agents all over the world, from royal princes down to domestic servants. But let me quote.

Unhappily, no friend was there to stop the Doctor quoting, and as a result, we have an exhibition of infantile credulity almost painful in its excess. We have to remind ourselves that the retailer of this narrative is an Oxford M.A., till recently a Fellow of a distinguished College there, and holds, moreover, the pastorate of a highly respectable Nonconformist congregation, when we read the mixture of absurdity and malice he here presents to us. We will let him quote, from M. du Belloy :

On the morning of the second Tuesday of every month, the president of the tribunal of the Inquisition, who is a Cardinal, receives from the secretary, who is always a *Dominican*,² the correspondence of the preceding month. After studying it, he sets aside the reports which contain nothing of importance, and classifies the others. In the evening, he submits the latter to a committee of eleven *Dominicans*,²

¹ P. 81.

² Italics in original. For once, we are interested to note, the Jesuits are not at the bottom of these Romish iniquities.

who sit with him in judgment upon them, and mark their decisions by affixing one or other of three seals on each document, a white one for Insanity, a grey one for Seclusion, and a red one for Death. The tribunal is secret: there are no archives:¹

Not even yet has Dr. Horton any suspicion of his informant. M. du Belloy has the recommendation of being an unfrocked priest, and what he says about Rome is so antecedently probable, and serves so to illustrate the Doctor's contention and confirm his views, that he might go even further without awaking doubt. And, indeed, he does go further, to the following effect. Dr. Horton, we presume, is synopsisizing his article:

M. du Belloy was present at a conclave of Inquisitors in the Convent of Minerva [*sic*]. "I remained," he says, "two hours at no small risk, for had I been discovered I should never have been seen again." He tells us that the three seals mean that the agent is to proceed against the person whom he has denounced, either by getting the man incarcerated, or committed to an asylum, or assassinated. "I remember," he writes, "the case of a statesman in Santa Fé of Bogota, whose daughter had become a Protestant. The unhappy father was sent a red seal, and was obliged to give effect to the sentence." Woe betide the agent who fails to execute the order. The red seal awaits himself. "I have good reason for saying," adds M. du Belloy, "that the Roman Inquisition at the present time is much more terrible than in the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth centuries, when it worked for the most part in the light of day. Nothing escapes that tribunal. As Cardinal Guidi, one of its former presidents declared, it is Mistress of the World."²

Under these circumstances, such being his belief, should we not admire Dr. Horton's courage in printing the above? If the anonymous statesman and reluctant murderer in Santa Fé of Bogota could not escape receiving the "Black Spot" (in this case, to be sure, a Red Seal), surely, Lyndhurst Road, Hampstead, is not secure. The incumbent must know that there are real live *Dominicans*, and doubtless a branch office of the Inquisition, within five minutes' walk of his church. Any day or any hour some Catholic acquaintance may receive one of the three seals above-mentioned, and be forced to proceed to fulfil the command. It is a poor consolation, but the best we can offer, to assure this fearless assailant of the Inquisition that only the White Seal is likely to be sent to

¹ Pp. 82, 83.

² P. 83.

Hampstead. We trust that, although we have assumed Dr. Horton's zeal and good faith, we may be forgiven for smiling at the ridiculous figure he cuts. We cannot be expected to pity a man who in trying to make us knaves makes a fool of himself. Now, as to the story, why, Dr. Newman described and discounted it half a century ago:

Sometimes [he says] the crime charged on us is brought out with such startling vividness and circumstantial finish as to seem to carry its own evidence with it, and to dispense, in the eyes of the public, with the references which in fairness should attend it. The scene is laid in some fortress of the savage Apennine or in secluded Languedoc, or in remote Poland, or the high table-land of Mexico [or in Santa Fé of Bogota]; or it is a legend about some priest of a small village of Calabria, called Buonavalle, in the fourteenth century; or about a monk of the monastery of S. Spirito, in S. Filippo d'Argiro, in the time of Charlemagne. Or the story runs, that Don Felix Malatesta de Guadelope, a Benedictine monk of Andalusia, and father confessor to the Prince of the Asturias, who died in 1821, left behind him his confessions in manuscript, which were carried off by the French, with other valuable documents, from his convent, which they pillaged in their retreat from the field of Salamanca; and that in these confessions he frankly avows that he had killed three of his monastic brothers of whom he was jealous, had poisoned half-a-dozen women, and sent off in boxes and hampers to Cadiz and Barcelona thirty-five infants; moreover, that he felt no misgivings about these abominable deeds, because, as he observes with great *naïveté*, he had every day, for many years, burnt a candle to the Blessed Virgin; had cursed periodically all heretics, especially the royal family of England; had burnt a student of Coimbra for asserting that the earth went round the sun; had worn about him day and night a relic of St. Diego; and had provided that five hundred Masses should be said for the repose of his soul within eight days after his decease.¹

These anti-Catholic fictions, be it observed, keep faithfully to type, and so long as the soil is provided by such as Dr. Horton, the crops will be sown by such as M. du Bellay.² We do not doubt that Newman's tale would have been trans-

¹ *Present Position*: "Fable the Basis of the Protestant View." (Pp. 93, 94.)

² "Du Bellay" seems to be the real name, which, by the way, does not appear in any of the lists of Vatican Council officials we have consulted. We have Dr. John Clifford's authority that he was once a Catholic priest. Dr. Clifford quotes him in a letter to the *Daily News* (Nov. 6, 1902) as disclosing the plan entertained by the Council of monopolizing higher education, "in order to secure a succession of young men trained by the Church of the Vatican for service in the army." (!) We notice that accuracy in names is not a strong point of Dr. Horton's. The nearest approach he can make to that of the late Papal envoy at Paris is "Mgr. Marignani." (p. 224.)

ferred bodily to *My Belief* if it had first appeared in *France et Évangile*. Our author's childish acceptance of the Inquisition tale of Rawhead and Bloodybones shows with what bias he approaches the study of history, and accounts for his strange misreadings of it. But if that story indicates how easily he can be deceived, we are rather at a loss to describe his connection with the following, illustrative as before of the persecuting spirit of Rome :

Professor Huxley playfully rallied George William [sic] Ward, the most learned and sincere of all the tractarian converts to Rome, on his readiness to put a stake in his garden and burn his Protestant guests. But Ward defended his conviction [*i.e.*, that such conduct was justifiable], and said that he only abstained from putting it into practice because it was not politic, not because it was not right.¹

Now we have the best authority for stating that the remark attributed to Dr. Ward is an absolute fabrication. We do not say, because we do not know, who fabricated it. Like all these stories, it is quoted without reference to sources, and Dr. Horton has shown himself in the past careless beyond measure in dealing with second-hand authorities. His previous exploits, too, in the art of what he calls "conflation," justify us in mistrusting any quotation of his which cannot be immediately verified.² "Conflation" is the process of detaching various passages in an author from their context and putting them together as if they were written thus, so that they receive a new and generally sinister meaning from their juxtaposition. As a matter of fact the above anecdote happens to be an excellent specimen of the art, and, thanks to references kindly furnished us by Mr. Wilfrid Ward, we are able with practical certainty to discover the originals. Let the reader then compare the above story with the following three extracts from *William George Ward and the Catholic Revival*.³ Huxley speaks in the first, Knowles in the second, and the third contains Tennyson's testimony.

¹ P. 82.

² For ample proofs of these assertions, see *The Methods of a Protestant Controversialist*, passim. Though challenged ten years ago by Mr. Britten to substantiate his assertion that he had "met with the term *Our Lord God the Pope*, in [his] reading, both of the renaissance and mediæval German literature," he has never yet been able to quote a single instance. See, also, *Dr. Horton on Catholic Truthfulness*, by the Rev. Sydney Smith, S.J., which deals very effectively with another polemical work of the Doctor's, entitled *England's Danger*.

³ Pp. 315, 316, 399 respectively.

(1) "It was not long after we had reached this stage [of friendliness] that, in the course of some truce in our internecine dialectic warfare, . . . Dr. Ward took me aside and opened his mind thus: 'You and I are on such friendly terms that I do not think it is right to let you remain ignorant of something I wish to tell you.' Rather alarmed at what this might portend, I begged him to say on. 'Well, we Catholics hold that So and So, and So and So (naming certain of our colleagues whose heresies were of a less deep hue than mine) are not guilty of absolutely unpardonable error; but your case is different, and I feel it unfair not to tell you so.' Greatly relieved I replied, without a moment's delay, perhaps too impulsively, 'My dear Dr. Ward, if you don't mind, I don't,' whereupon we parted with a hearty handshake: and intermitted neither fighting nor friendship thenceforth."

(2) "This [personal kindliness] was the more remarkable because many of us used to say that were the Inquisition re-established, we heretics would rather take our chance of escape from Manning than from Ward. We felt that Ward's relentless logic would stick at nothing, not even at the protests of his most amiable and gentle nature. I recollect Huxley going with me to dine at your father's house one day. The first thing he did was to go and peer out of the window. Dr. Ward asked him what he was doing, on which he said, 'I was looking in your garden for the *stake*, Dr. Ward, which I suppose you have got ready for us after dinner.'"

(3) They were, latterly, close friends and on almost playful terms. Tennyson loved Ward's plainness of speech, even if his sentiments were intolerable. He told me that in the days when the question of persecution was debated at the Metaphysical Society he said to Ward: "'You know you would try to get me put in prison if the Pope told you to.' Ward could not say no." Lord Tennyson added, "He only replied, 'the Pope would never tell me to do anything so foolish!'"

The process will now be clear. Given a hazy recollection of these three passages, and an extreme readiness to believe evil of Catholics, and it is an easy matter to make Ward defend in earnest a remark uttered by Huxley in jest, and to turn Tennyson's evidence of Ward's repudiation of persecution into a declaration of his willingness to persecute.¹ Just as

¹ Dr. Horton is particularly unfortunate in his references to Dr. Ward. In one of his letters in answer to Mr. James Britten, he quotes, "William George Ward, by far the most distinguished writer on Roman Catholic doctrine in England," as being in the *habit* of saying: "Make yourself clear that you are justified in deception, and then lie like a trooper." The facts in this case are (1) Ward, on the one occasion he was known to have said those words, was still an Anglican; (2) He was merely stating in his whimsically emphatic way, the doctrine of many sound Protestant moralists as distinguished from the more delicate consideration shown for the claims of veracity by Catholic theologians. (See *The Methods of a Protestant Controversialist*, p. 20, and *Dr. Horton on Catholic Truthfulness*, pp. 21—25, where the whole question is exhaustively discussed.)

Dr. Horton was persuaded that he had "met with the term 'Our Lord God the Pope'" in his reading of Renaissance and mediæval German literature, so, doubtless, he felt sure that his anecdote occurred in substance in the *Life of Ward*. We cannot, as he does so often, jump from likelihood to certainty, and so we are quite willing to believe that not he, but some expert of his school, concocted that silly story, in which case his honesty is again saved at the expense of his intelligence.¹

Much more remains to be said, were there need of saying it, about Dr. Horton's indictment of Catholicity. He employs most of the weapons in the ultra-Protestant armoury, weapons we are wont to see wielded not by educated Oxford men, but by the Kensits, the Collettes, and the Porcellis. Absolution, of course, is sold for money, priests are necessarily corrupt and degraded, convents full of scandals, &c. At one time the Catholic reaction is attributed to men's desire to go on sinning and yet be saved,² at another, to the fact that "the genius of Newman dazzled the imagination of England; the practical zeal of Manning softened the heart."³ But we must draw our study of Bigotry to a close with one final illustration.

A main contention of Dr. Horton's is that Catholic countries necessarily deteriorate and Protestant countries progress under the influence of their respective creeds.⁴ We shall not delay to point out that this argument, so far as it is debatable at all, makes material prosperity at once the test of divine favour and the measure of real civilization, and is, moreover, contradicted by many instances, present and past. We merely wish to show that under this conviction our author's religion, for all its profession of life and liberty, takes on a bitterness and narrow-

¹ His habit, however, is so strong, that he "conflates" even his *Virgil*. Readers will find the originals of

*O terque quaterque beatos
Agrícolas, sua si bona norint*

(quoted on p. 234) in *Æneid*, I. 94, and *Georgics*, II. 458—9.

² Pp. 87, 272.

³ P. 78.

⁴ Yet throughout his book he bewails the decay and disappearance of Protestantism. "Germany has little more than an official belief in religion" (p. 12), "the vast bulk of the [English] people are indifferent to religion" (*ibid.*) "Thoughtful and intelligent Europe is now non-Christian. The working-classes of Europe are anti-Christian" (p. 25.) "Doubtless, it [Continental Protestantism] is largely Unitarian, but it is also largely dead" (p. 93.) Are we to ascribe the present prosperity of Protestant nations to their having shed their Protestantism?

ness that recalls ancient Judaism. He comes nigh to identifying Christ's world-wide religion with the possession of English nationality.

England [cries our patriot] can only become Roman by ceasing to be English. There are many converts to Rome, but they are perverts from England; they lose the national spirit, their sympathies fall away *from all that makes England great*. The Irish and the French Canadians are the clearest evidence that Papists cannot be English. They are *tolerated aliens* in a vast Empire which is built up on the Bible, on individual freedom, on the truth of man's direct relation to God, which they as Papists cannot even comprehend.¹

Were we not right when we implied above that if you scratched Dr. Horton you would find Torquemada? This loud-mouthed professor of tolerance, nay, of respect and sympathy, clasps to his brotherly bosom, as fellow-subjects in an Empire "built up on the Bible," millions of Hindus and Mussulmans, and devil-worshippers, and the like, but the Irish and the French-Canadians are but "tolerated aliens," tolerated, we presume, only because it would not be politic to destroy them. "Bigotry," let us remind ourselves, "is the infliction of our own unproved First Principles on others and *the treating others with scorn and hatred* for not accepting them." Here, surely, we have it at its worst. But Dr. Horton will tell us he does not speak without experience of these "tolerated aliens."

I was present once [he says] at Mass in a Wicklow village. The chapel was crowded with the people high and low. Nothing could be more edifying, until one looked into their faces (!) The priest explained from the altar that it was Sunday, and that they must do an extra act of religion, read a pious book, or perform a good deed. But the easiest way to discharge the obligation was to stay for the Rosary, which would only take twenty minutes. This, he explained, consisted of the Lord's prayer, which was the best of prayers, and must be said thoughtfully, not gabbled over, and of the *Hail Mary*, for when they came to die they would want the Blessed Virgin with them, and how could they expect her to come if they omitted the Rosary. So many *Pater nosters*, then so many *Ave Marias*, then more *Pater nosters*, and then more *Aves*, and so on for twenty minutes. After this edifying exposition the Rosary began. The priest and the acolytes rattled off the prayers at such a rate that no words were audible, and the thing was through in less than a quarter of an hour.

I watched the people as they came out. There was no gleam of

¹ P. 179.

light, no trace of worship. Dull, listless, unintelligent, they had done what the priest had told them.¹

We confess this spectacle of smug Nonconformity from Hampstead passing judgment, on such slender grounds, on the state before God of people who, with all their faults, are generally held to be amongst the most spiritually-minded in the world, fills us with a sense of loathing. Did Dr. Horton mutter, "Thank God, I am not as the rest of men," as he watched these poor peasants coming from prayers, which he cannot even describe correctly, without those visible haloes that decorate the congregation at Lyndhurst Road? Why, we have a right to ask, does he not himself observe his admonitions to others. He is emphatic in urging his readers to abstain from trying to judge the soul-state of their neighbours. "The spiritual experience of another person cannot be known to you from the inside,"² he says, and he naïvely illustrates the fact by declaring that he himself is not nearly so good as many people think him.

Knowing then how completely I am misread by others, and even by those who have the fullest opportunity of knowing me, I settle it with myself that I can never expect to know in any real sense the experience of others.³

Except, of course, that of Papists and devil-worshippers and other abandoned creatures, whose spiritual experience can be estimated quite *à priori*.⁴

But our readers must now feel that they have had quite enough of Dr. Horton. Bigotry is one of the worst of mental and moral diseases, and the study of it is sure to be unpleasant. However, it is necessary, if we are to understand the forces which Catholicity has here to contend against. Reasoning is of little avail, and even the argument of a good life, which we all can and ought to advance, is powerless against such perverse misinterpretation.

¹ Pp. 180, 181.

² P. 222. "From the *outside*" would have made his meaning clearer.

³ P. 223.

⁴ For the most part Dr. Horton confines his abuse of Catholicity to the system or to individuals in the vague. But we are bound to notice that on one occasion his bigotry makes him so far forget what is due to Christian charity, not to say the elementary instincts of a gentleman, as to impute unworthy motives to a living person. On p. 78 we find it insinuated that "an English Princess renounced her Protestant faith to marry the *Spanish King*." That this grossly uncharitable assertion, which, from the nature of the case, is incapable of proof, was common amongst his class does not excuse Dr. Horton for giving it further vogue in his book.

We had intended to say something about the constructive side, so to call it, of Dr. Horton's book, but we have little space left and no inclination. It would not be quite fair to judge its value by what we have seen of its attitude towards Catholicism, for it contains true and eloquent passages on the value of Prayer, on the necessity of Religion, and on the Supernatural in Christianity. Nay, one chapter dealing with the relations of Christianity to Social Order, might almost, if purged of its anti-Catholicism, be printed as a C. T. S. tract. But what the author explains and defends is so obviously merely subjective, that we fear it has little value as an *Apologia*. The very first sentence—"I could never bring myself to any admiration of the schoolman's famous formula, *Credo quia impossibile*"—containing, as it does, two gross blunders,¹ is at once characteristic of the author's habits of mind, and ominous of what is to come. It is enough, then, to point out that the apologist is a Christian only in the City-Temple sense, that he is an extreme individualist in religion, with no conception of a Church, and no belief in a Bible except in so far as his inner experience bears it out, that his philosophy, as far as it is intelligible, is a sort of pantheism, that he rejects creeds and dogmas as fetters of the intellect,—in a word, that "His Belief," in ultimate logical analysis, is Belief in Himself.

JOSEPH KEATING.

¹ The phrase should be, *Certum est, quia impossibile*; it was used in a passage describing the Divine paradox of the Incarnation by Tertullian (*De Carne Christi*, 5: see THE MONTH, July, 1906, p. 94), who, of course, was not a Schoolman, and, at that time, not even a Catholic.

Science in the Nursery.

AS we should all be aware, for so we are constantly assured there can be no such instrument of education in its truest sense as the study of science, for beyond all else this will train the mind to a love of truth, and teach it how truth may be acquired. Science will, before all else, impress on its student the absolute necessity of asserting nothing for which there is not full and demonstrative evidence, ever bearing in mind the golden rule formulated by Ruskin, "In science you must not talk before you know."

Such is undoubtedly the theory of the matter, on the strength of which the educational value of science is assumed, and it is clear that upon the agreement of practice with such theory, the whole value of scientific teaching must entirely depend. How far such agreement is to be discovered in the flood of so-called scientific literature designed for the benefit of children is quite another question.

Here, for example, is a number of the *Children's Encyclopædia* (Part 5), issued by Messrs. Harmsworth, in the prospectus of which much stress is laid on the valuable scientific instruction which it provides, specially prepared for the benefit of the youthful readers to whom it addresses itself.

What that class is, the nature of the topics treated at once lets us know. The children to whom the *Encyclopædia* makes its appeal are evidently those for whom the infant-school and kindergarten are the natural resort. On the front of the cover there is, indeed, exhibited a twin procession of school-boys of cricketing age, and school-girls to match, for whom the work might be supposed to be meant. But such an idea speedily vanishes when we examine a little further, for the bulk of the contents would be scouted as babyish by any youngsters beyond the nursery. On the back of the same cover is an address by a cat, signing itself "Furry Fluffkins," to the readers of the *Encyclopædia*, who are styled "Dear Chicks." It contains

information about "the Little Sparrowkins, and Mrs. Hippe's Kindergarten Boys," and a picture of a cats' school, with "Cousin Tom" (a young tom-cat) wearing a fool's cap, and playing *diabolo* to amuse himself while put in the corner.

Looking inside, we find various lessons given, which enable us to gauge the acquirements of those who need them. In writing, they have got to "letters with loops above the lines." In numeration, to "names of the numbers from 10 to 19." In computation, to such additions as $8+9$ and such subtractions as $16-5$. They are introduced to words of two syllables—"Dol-ly," "Don-key," "Mon-key." Some familiar nursery rhymes—the "Song of Sixpence," "Mother Hubbard," and "Miss Muffet," are given with illustrations, and an attempt is made to amplify and finish off the story they tell. There are also "Very little Verses for very little people," with illustrations in the style of *Comic Cuts*, and there are instructions for making toy animals.

From such examples we may judge by what manner of scientific instruction these small-folk are likely to profit. They evidently require something very simple, and the facts set before them should not only be beyond dispute, but should concern things of which they have some knowledge, so as to quicken their intelligent observation of nature.

But when we come to the scientific portion, we find it entirely occupied with inquiries to which no man on earth can give a positive answer, and with surmises as to what may have occurred under conditions concerning which nobody can ever have any definite and certain knowledge. The topic here selected is "How Life came out of the Sea." Life, it is said, must certainly once have begun upon this earth, and plant-life must have preceded animal-life, which could not exist without it. Life must, moreover, have begun in the sea, water being the great necessity for living things. After a time, living creatures, born and bred in the sea, must actually have dared to leave the sea, "a very brave and a very big thing to do." Perhaps some of them left the sea by flying,—but this appears improbable. What certainly happened in some instances, and probably in all, is that life swam ashore. Very likely, the moon helped by means of high tides. Anyhow, life came ashore, and had to do so in order to make progress, for as we can judge by the fishes, the sea-dwellers are sadly behind land-dwellers in matter of intelligence, owing to the small amount

of oxygen found in the water, especially deep water. But on land there is a plentiful supply, "so life was abundantly rewarded for the great step from the water to the land." No doubt, times were hard at first, "because the arrangements which do very well for breathing oxygen in water are of no use at all for breathing oxygen in air." Therefore, when life first came ashore it had to learn how to invent lungs. But, in one way or another, this difficulty was surmounted, and life began its wonderful march, towards the point of development which it has now reached.

This then is science, as she is wrote for the instruction of little mites who are still struggling with pothooks and hangers or words of two syllables. What can they possibly make of it? What, moreover, could the most accomplished man of science pretend to know about the whole matter? So utterly in the dark are we still, and not improbably shall ever remain, that quite recently there has been a complete revolution in scientific opinion upon this very subject. It used to be assumed, as our encyclopædic instructor still assumes, that fish life originated in the sea, and accordingly that pelagic fishes were the original and elder branch of the family. Now, however, we have changed all that, and the commencements of life are assigned to the marsh or swamp, 'twixt land and water, the denizens of which could develop either way, into forms specialized respectively for ocean and *terra firma*.

Of all this the little ones can of course have no suspicion, nor of the absurdity of giving the name of science to what has no more right to such a title than Æsop's Fables or the adventures of Brer Rabbit, being equally a product of the imagination. And yet the very subject of which the writer thus makes a mere toy might very easily be made not only a means of conveying solid information, but also vastly more interesting than all this vague talk about things—such, for example, as oxygen—concerning which infants can have no real ideas. Would it not, for instance, be far more profitable to tell them of the migrations of salmon from fresh water to salt, or the still more mysterious migrations of eels, or those of herrings, which are so important to mankind, but seem to become more puzzling in proportion as they are investigated? Then there are whales and porpoises, which must presumably, according to our authority, once have swum ashore in their remote ancestors, and having become as different from fishes as

are horses and cows, have swum out to sea again. Then there is the old story of barnacle geese springing from barnacle shell-fish, which might serve to point the useful moral that there is danger of giving too much play to our fancy in matters of this kind. Would a child, after reading the sort of thing here presented, have any more knowledge concerning life and its history than before? On the other hand, given the necessary taste and aptitude for such pursuits, what a field for instruction and enjoyment might he not find on the shore, if, instead of speculating as to what may or may not have occurred in ages the history of which we shall never know, he would but look and see what there *is*, and take for his guide an old-fashioned work such as Wood's *Common Objects* or even Kingsley's *Glaucus*. What histories there are to learn in every pool and basin; what marvels that would be deemed incredible, did they not happen to be manifestly true. Who would imagine, for instance, that a lobster could ever change the coat of mail in which he is encased? Yet he is found periodically to change, not only this, but the external cornea of his eyes, the membrane of his ears, and the lining of his stomach. The hermit, or soldier, crab is likewise given to change, but of a rather different kind. Being provided by nature with but an incomplete suit of armour, which protects only his fore-parts, he has to insert his defenceless portion in the abandoned shell of a whelk or other mollusk, and as he grows too big for such a habitation must find another more suitable, and endeavour to perform the critical operation of flitting from one to the other unmolested by any of his numerous enemies. Frequently there lodges in the same shell, but farther in, a curious worm—*Nereis*—which has been known to stretch out sufficiently to snatch a morsel of food which the hermit was about to enjoy. Then there are other crustaceans, shrimps and "sand boys," besides sea-anemones, star-fish, sea urchins, and what-not, each with their own strange history, *terebellas*, which, like our fresh-water caddis-worms, build for themselves a tubular dwelling-place of bits of stone and other material,—to say nothing of the multitude of shell-fish which, familiar as they are, are still capable of affording surprises to those who will study their manners and customs. The limpet, for example, has long been regarded as the very type of fixity in one spot, but is now found to range in certain conditions of the tide, over an area of some square yards in quest of food.

Such are a few promiscuous specimens, taken at random, from amongst the countless objects which the sea-shore gives an opportunity of studying; and much the same may be said of any brook or pond. If we really wish children to obtain some knowledge of nature, would it not be well at least to begin with the study of things which they can actually observe, and, although they can never obtain to such complete knowledge of what they behold as their instructor professes concerning what neither he nor any one else ever saw, they can at least satisfy themselves to some degree as to what actually happens.

But what actually happens,—the mere facts of Nature,—appears to have little interest for “scientists” of the class we are considering, in comparison with what they obviously regard as the all-important task of writing natural history as, they think, that history ought to be. It would even appear as if facts are sometimes regarded as imposing irksome trammels on the imagination, just as we may suppose that Homer, when engaged upon the *Odyssey*, would not have cared much for a matter-of-fact log-book of Ulysses’ voyage.

No doubt the little folk who get the *Encyclopædia* will follow such an instructor with no less confidence that he is going to lead them into a veritable fairy-land than the little boys and girls of Hamelin who crowded after the Pied Piper. But should not the Society for Prevention of Cruelty to Children interfere to prevent such reckless impositions on helpless infancy?

J. G.

*Indulgences.*¹

SECOND ARTICLE.¹

3. *The Warrant in history for Indulgences.*—My endeavour in the preceding article was to show that, whether or not the system of Indulgences can claim for itself the warrant of an original divine sanction, at least it involves no doctrinal element in conflict either with the doctrine of the all-sufficiency of our Lord's Atonement, or that of the exclusive jurisdiction over post-Baptismal sin of the Sacrament of Penance; but that on the contrary it is nothing else than a mode of practically applying these self-same doctrinal principles, and relies on them for the whole of its efficacy. I may seem to have given up too much space to this speculative part of the subject, but of the two it was more important to explain the mechanism, so to speak, of the system, than to discuss the stages of its historical development; and this for two reasons. First, because by so doing I have, I trust, succeeded in showing that such historical development as there has been, has been development not so much in doctrine as in discipline and devotion—which latter kind of development can legitimately be freer and fuller in its range than the former; and, secondly, because (to repeat a reminder already given) for us who believe the Holy See to be under the continuous guidance of the Holy Ghost, the simple fact that it gives its deliberate sanction to so persistent and universal a practice is sufficient evidence that the practice is a legitimate development of the original Christian revelation. For those who do not share this belief in the Church's indefectibility, it may, now that the mechanism of the system is understood, suffice if I can prove to them this conclusion hypothetically—namely, that, *if* it can be established on convincing grounds that the Holy See is thus divinely guarded, the simple history of the Indulgence system proves the legitimacy of its origin and development. I may,

¹ A Paper read to the Guild of St. Thomas of Canterbury on May 12, 1908.

however, remind members of the Guild of St. Thomas that we have an affirmation of this principle to which I am appealing in a writer of such authority and antiquity as St. Augustine. "If (he says) a custom is observed by the Church throughout the world, to question whether it ought to be observed would be an act of the maddest insolence" (*insolentissimae insaniae*).¹

Still, it would be surprising if the Indulgence system had sprung up at a late date in the Church's history without any previous institutions to which one could point as having led up to it. Nor was it so. It is a simple historical fact that it grew by a natural process out of the double practice which prevailed in the earliest Christian period of inflicting severe canonical penances on persons guilty of grave sin, and of remitting these penances in whole or in part under certain circumstances. We may broadly distinguish four periods in the evolution of the system. In the first period, which somewhat outlasted the three centuries of pagan persecution, the prevailing custom was to exclude from the society of the faithful and the participation of the sacraments those guilty of idolatry, murder, and fornication (and possibly, in some places, of other similarly grave offences). This exclusion was held to be the gravest of the penances inflicted, but it was not the only one, for long prayers, fastings, scourgings, and other mortifications, were also imposed in the discretion of the Bishop, and according to a sort of tariff which gradually formed itself. And it was likewise forbidden to penitents to enter upon marriage or even to use marriages already contracted; it was forbidden to discharge any public functions, and so on; and, whereas the exclusion from communion might be only for a time (but a time of several years), these further punishments were for life. On the other hand it was fully recognized that the Bishop's power to bind and loose included the power to relax in God's name, a part or the whole of these severe penances, as also that a petition on behalf of any of the penitents made by the Confessors in prison awaiting their martyrdom was a suitable ground for granting these relaxations. This sort of relaxation may truly be regarded as an Indulgence in its earliest stage; for there is sufficient evidence in the writings of the time to show that the Bishop's sentence in loosing as well as in binding, was understood to be ratified in Heaven, which implies that penance and Indulgence both counted for profit in the life to come as well as the present.

¹ Ep. 118, c. 5. al. 54, c. 5.

And the right of petition, accorded to the martyrs, contained in nucleus the idea of the Treasury of the Church.

For causes into which we must not now enter, the use of canonical penance, so far as it involved lengthened exclusion from the Sacred Offices and Holy Communion, gradually passed into desuetude after the Empire became Christian. Still, the infliction of penances in other respects was continued, though with a growing tendency to mitigate their severity and duration; and, although there were no longer martyrs to exercise their right of petition, the Bishops continued to relax when the fervour of the penitents, or their weakness, seemed to require it; and the practice of commutation came in, according to which shorter but severer came to be substituted for longer and easier penances, or even easier penances were substituted for harder. Also, when the Teutonic races were brought into the Church, perhaps under the influence of their Wergild customs, the commutations often took the form of pecuniary fines to be applied to the building or endowment of churches, or even to the building of bridges or other works of a secular kind, but yet of a charitable or philanthropic complexion. Moreover, during the earlier part of this period, in order to secure some sort of unity of treatment, canons were drawn up by Councils which appraised the gradations, in point of duration and severity, of the penances suitable for the different offences. Thus we have Canons of Elvira (A.D. 300), of Ancyra (314), of Nicæa (325), and Decrees of Popes Siricius, Innocent I., and Leo I., which were of this nature. Later came the *Libri Poenitentiales*, which extended and adapted these early canons, and drew up rules of detail. Of these one of the earliest and best known was that of St. Theodore of Canterbury, from which the practice thus ordained seems to have passed through Anglo-Saxon and Celtic missionaries to the Continent. St. Theodore himself, however, must have drawn largely from the rules prevalent in the eastern regions from which he came, and indeed that is implied or indicated in the text of his Penitential. Similar Penitentials are attributed to St. Bede, St. Egbert, Bishop Halitgar of Cambrai, Rabanus Maurus, and others. It is to these Canons and Penitentials that we must look for the origin of that terminology of modern Indulgences which has already been considered, as may be seen by referring to the Penitentials of SS. Theodore and Egbert, in Haddan and Stubbs's *Councils and Ecclesiastical Documents*, Vol. III.

The Penitentials tariffed the penances in this way, and the Indulgences tariffed their remissions correspondingly. The Penitentials said, "Let him do penance on bread and water seven or ten years, or months, or quarantines;" and the Indulgences said, "Let him be remitted three years, or months, or quarantines, or all of his allotted penance."

The third period we may conceive roughly as commencing in the eleventh century, and as characterized by the custom of granting Indulgences no longer to individuals only, but more usually to those who fulfilled certain prescribed conditions, of which latter the chief were (1) to give alms for the building of churches, or hospitals, or even roads and bridges (regarded as corporal works of mercy); (2) to go on pilgrimages of devotion to privileged shrines, particularly to Rome or the Holy Land, or where that was impossible, to shrines nearer home which were taken to represent those originals; (3) to go on Crusade for the delivery of the Holy Land, or the defence of Christendom in some one or other of its frontiers. The effect of this newly-developed method of granting Indulgences to all in general who complied with the conditions was to extend their use considerably, and we may note in connection with each of the three mentioned classes the far-reaching effects on Christendom which they brought about. The Indulgences of the first class undoubtedly had a considerable effect in raising up the magnificent cathedrals, churches, and charitable institutions to which the Middle Ages gave birth in England and on the Continent. Those of the third class stirred Christendom in the way with which we are all familiar, and, if the dissensions of Sovereigns, and the intermixture of human motives, spoiled a splendid conception for the preservation of Christendom, we are beginning to realize how splendid it was, and how it might have succeeded if the conditions asked for in the grants had been observed. To the category of pilgrimages must be referred the Jubilees which, beginning in 1300 from a spontaneous impulse on the part of the people, have continued, with some vicissitudes, ever since, and been extended; and which have invariably evoked a mighty outburst of piety and devotion. Also with the Crusades began the custom of granting Plenary Indulgences. The terms used by Urban II. in 1095, in the Council of Clermont, in granting what is reckoned as the first Plenary Indulgence ("Whoever from pure devotion and not for the sake of obtaining glory or money shall set out to deliver

the Church of God at Jerusalem shall count this journey in the place of all his penance") may not seem, and perhaps were not intended, to do more than remit all such penances as had been actually imposed on the individual Crusaders. But the time had passed, or was passing, during which the tariffs of the Penitentials were consistently applied, and it was inevitable that the term "plenary" should, in the absence of penances actually inflicted, come to mean all such penance or punishment as, in the eyes of God, was due to the man's sins, and so it has come to be understood. One more custom in connection with Indulgences came into use either during this second period, or perhaps earlier—that of applying them to the holy dead. The Pope has no jurisdiction over the dead, but if an Indulgence involves not merely a remission, but the application of satisfactions drawn from the Treasury of the Church, is it not in this last respect applicable of its own nature to the souls in Purgatory? It was held—long certainly before the time of St. Thomas of Aquin, who treats it as certain and expounds the doctrine—that it was thus applicable, and might be applied by the Holy See and the gainer of the Indulgence, only that the application must be by way of suffrage, or prayer to Almighty God to accept the satisfaction offered for that purpose.

If we may distinguish still a fourth period in the development of Indulgences, extending from the latter part of the Middle Ages to the present day, its characteristics are these two: (1), that during it, Indulgences have multiplied enormously, and (2), that the conditions on which they are granted have been lightened to an extent so considerable that they have ceased to be onerous. When the first Plenary Indulgence was offered to the Crusaders, the conditions for gaining it were onerous enough. Now the same spiritual benefit can be procured in a hundred different ways on conditions so simple as, after Confession and Communion, reciting a few prayers. It is natural that we should ask, in view of such a change, whether it could be for good; and so did many ask themselves at the time of the Reformation. Indeed, the Fathers of Trent in their decree on Indulgences, show their bias in this direction by "desiring that in accord with the ancient and approved custom in the Church moderation be observed, lest by excessive facility ecclesiastical discipline be enervated."¹ None the less the Popes,

¹ Sess. xxv., *Decretum de Indulgentiis*.

even the best of Popes, have continued ever since to multiply Indulgences and to grant them on the easiest conditions, and this is still the rule. How are we to judge of it? I raise the question at this stage because it is at this stage that it is sure to suggest itself; it will be more convenient to consider it a little later on.

4. *Abuses, real or supposed.*—(a) Were not Indulgences granted for the remission of guilt as well as temporal punishment, being thus made into a means of dispensing with the Sacrament of Penance? Dr. H. C. Lea maintains that they were, and makes a strong point of it. "For ages [he says] there was a wide-spread popular belief that Plenary Indulgences were a *culpa et poena* (from guilt as well as punishment); and this belief was a considerable factor in contributing to the large revenues which the Holy See drew from their sale throughout Europe."¹ This last clause implies that the Popes connived at the scandalous misconstruction, and in one or two places Dr. Lea does not hesitate to say as much in express words. Still his main point, of which he is most confident, is that it was thus that, with the knowledge and tacit approval of their spiritual rulers, the people understood the system. An unwary reader of Dr. H. C. Lea's pages might be deeply impressed by the wealth of references with which he supports his positions, for such a reader naturally assumes that he summarizes correctly the meaning of the authors cited. But those who have taken the pains to look up his references have discovered that it is the exception rather than the rule when he summarizes correctly, and nowhere is this more the case than in the pages he gives to this particular point about Indulgences. Thus he writes: "An Indulgence which would release from Hell as well as from Purgatory, which required neither repentance nor amendment, was a much more saleable article than one which was good only for those who had truly repented, confessed their sins, and been absolved; and the peripatetic vendors through whom nearly all the trade was conducted never hesitated as to the representations necessary to attract customers."² For which sweeping statement he refers learnedly to "*Astesani Summa*, lib. v. tit. xl. art. 5, q. 1." Yet all that Astesanus (a fifteenth century writer) says, in the place cited (or anywhere else), is that Indulgences cannot be gained by persons who are in mortal sin, and that this is why

¹ *Auricular Confession and Indulgences*, iii. p. 53.

² *Ibid.* p. 51.

in all Indulgence grants comes the clause, "if they are truly contrite and have made their confession;" but Astesanus adds: "It is a good thing for persons in sin to do the works enjoined by the Indulgence (*i.e.*, the prayers, alms, &c.), because this may under God's mercy lead them to repentance." In other words, Astesanus just states in a few short but clear sentences the Church's invariable doctrine on Indulgences, and he is cited by Dr. Lea as testifying directly to the unscrupulousness of the whole body of Indulgence-preachers, and the corresponding credulity of the whole mass of the people. It is a typical specimen of Dr. Lea's method.

However, there is just one phrase of frequent occurrence which Dr. Lea rides to death, but which, until it is examined, may appear to give some countenance to his contention that Indulgences were thought to remit the sin itself, not its temporal punishment only. This is the phrase already mentioned, the phrase *a culpa et poena*. Certain Indulgences, and particularly the Jubilee Indulgences, were described as Indulgences *a culpa et poena*. The term indeed was not employed by any Pope in an official document, but had somehow or other got into popular use, and the theologians often referred to it, and explained how it might be understood—though often also characterizing it as incorrect (*impropria*). Some few explained that it may be held to designate an ordinary Plenary Indulgence, as presupposing and completing the action of the Sacrament of Penance—in this sense that the sacrament takes away what is substantial, namely the *guilt*, and the Indulgence when added to it removes even the (temporal) *punishment*. But the more usual explanation of the phrase *a poena et culpa* is that it designates the Indulgence-grants usual in time of Jubilee; by which, over and beyond the Indulgence proper, leave was given to choose a confessor who for that occasion had faculties to absolve the recipient in the confessional from all reserved cases. On this I may quote John von Palz, a member of Luther's own Order, who studied at Erfurt some twenty years before him. Palz was himself an Indulgence-preacher of note, and at the request of the Elector Frederick (afterwards Luther's friend) wrote his *Coelifodina*, an enlarged edition of which was afterwards published at Erfurt at the very time when Luther was making his studies there. The book embodies the instructions Palz used to give to the people when engaged in Indulgence preaching. It is therefore much to our purpose.

It may be objected [he says in this *Coelifodina*], that in time of Jubilee a man is commonly said to be absolved *a poena et culpa*. I answer, that is true, and is because a Jubilee is something more than a bare Indulgence, inasmuch as it includes (1) the authority to confess and absolve, and (2) together with this an Indulgence for the remission of punishment; so that it includes the Sacrament of Penance and an Indulgence properly so-called. Or, to put it more clearly, the term "Indulgence" is taken in two senses. In one sense it is taken for the bare remission of punishment, and as such it does not extend to the remission of guilt. In another and broader sense it is taken for a Jubilee, that is, for an Indulgence-letter which includes a Jubilee, and then it extends to the remission of guilt as well as punishment, since commonly, when the Pope gives a Jubilee, he does not give a bare Indulgence, but gives besides authority to receive confessions and absolve from all sins even as regards guilt. And thus guilt is remitted through the Sacrament of Penance, which is thus introduced, and the punishment through the Indulgence thereby given.¹

That this is the kind of teaching the German people received, and on which they were formed in the time of Luther and the age that preceded him, may be further confirmed by reference to the many works of popular instruction which circulated among them in those days. Of these Jansen, in his *History of the German people*, and still further in his *Answer to my Critics*, has given a most satisfying account. "In no time (he says) was so much written on Indulgences as in the fifteenth century,"² and he cites, and in some cases quotes, such writings as Geiler von Kaisersberg's Sermons, Scheffer's *Seelenführer*, the *Summa Johannis*, the *Hymelsstrass*, Wittenweibe's *Catechetische Braut-examen*, the *Seelentrost*, the *Erklärung der Glaubensartikel*. From the last of these I may take the following passage, in which it replies to those who say that Indulgences "are pardons of sin in return for money paid, and are put up for sale."

The object [in granting them] is the praise and glory of God, not the acquisition of money. Nor do all gain the Indulgence who contribute to building or support of churches but only those who are free from mortal sin, and give out of their devotion, in true faith, with great confidence in the communion and merits of those saints to whose honour and veneration the churches are built, and with a special trust in the gracious aid of God.

¹ See article by Dr. Paulus in the Innsbruck *Zeitschrift für Kath. Theologie*, 1898, p. 148.

² Ap. Jansen, *Geschichte des deutschen Volkes*, i. p. 44.

On the other hand it cannot be denied that some, perhaps many, Indulgence-preachers did misrepresent the character of the spiritual goods they had to dispense. In all ages there will be a class of charlatans who seek their livelihood by trading on the simplicity of the poor, and passing off upon them spurious wares. They adapt themselves with much shrewdness to the circumstances of the times. In modern times they are known in the secular department for their quack medicines and their bogus companies, and in the religious department for their bogus convent-stories and garbled quotations, by circulating which they drive a roaring trade. In the middle ages they donned the friar's cowl and cord, and dealt in spurious relics or misrepresentations of Indulgences—being at times persons who had been really commissioned by Church authorities in ignorance of their real character, and at other times presenting commissions as false as their wares. Chaucer's Pardoner was a specimen of the class, and his words,

For mine entente is not but for to winne
And nothing for correction of sinne,

well expressed their ruling idea.

Thus Boniface IX. in 1390, in his letter to Bishop Benedict of Ferrara, his treasurer in those parts, complains of "certain mendicants who (he has heard), trusting in faculties whether authentic or spurious, have for tiny sums of money, given pretended absolutions to people who had committed atrocious crimes for which they showed no repentance whatever." This he says is conduct which every age would have regarded as most foolish (*absurdissimum*).¹ Bishop Benedict is to inquire how far it is true, and proceed accordingly. Moreover, several Councils, such as the Fourth Lateran (1215), and the Councils of Lyons (1245), and Vienne (1311), had expressly adverted to the existence of these impostors, and legislated for the repression of their abominations. And the Council of Trent²—on the ground that these remedies (applied by former Councils), had proved powerless, and the malice of the *quaestuarii* had even increased to the great scandal and dissatisfaction of the faithful, so that there seems to be no further hope of their amendment,—“decreed that from thenceforth their name and use should be abolished altogether from all parts of Christendom.” And this was done,

¹ Raynaldus, in ann. 1390.

² Sess. xxi. cap. 9, *De Reformatione*.

though we must be careful to distinguish between the *quaestuarii* and the special preachers. Assigned preachers were to continue, as they still do, and why not? But the administration of the funds was to be transferred to the local Bishops, who were to publish the Indulgences at the due times, and to collect the alms, without making any charge whatever for their trouble in doing so.

Still if some Indulgence-preachers, perhaps many, were unscrupulous, others, perhaps the majority, were conscientious and fervent. Peter the Hermit, and St. Bernard, it must be remembered, were Indulgence-preachers, and so was John von Palz, already quoted, as well as Albrecht v. Weissenstein,¹ both whose writings are extant, and show them to have been right-minded preachers, one belonging to the same neighbourhood as Luther, and only a few years earlier, the other to Switzerland, a few decades earlier. Palz tells us his own experience of Indulgence-preaching with evident sincerity, in the following passage :

At the time of Jubilee all people attend, including the greatest sinners who rarely if ever come to sermons at other times. At such a time of grace, a preacher can in a short time do more good among the people than he could otherwise do in twenty years, as experience has shown. . . . The Most Reverend Raymund [Perraud], the legate, selected and prepared all the most learned, esteemed, and devout persons he could find in the different universities, colleges, and religious congregations, and sent them out [to preach]; and by this means won over to this pious work the people of both sexes, and every condition, and so converted sinners and delivered an infinite number of souls, both of the living and dead, from their [temporal] punishments.

Many other testimonies, ancient and modern, could be brought in support of this, which when we hear it, reminds us of the good harvests which our modern mission-preachers are able to gather in.

(b) *Were not Indulgences sold?* That they were is popularly believed, and, if one disputes the fact, one is liable to have produced some copy or other of a small document which is said to be an Indulgence, and bears the name of the recipients and the signature of the subcommissioner—Tetzel (or another). At the end is a form of absolution which is represented to us as giving the operative terms by which the Indulgence is conveyed,

¹ See Paulus, *ibid.* pp. 48, 443.

and we are further instructed that what happened was that a man went to the place where such Indulgences were obtainable, paid so much money down according to the price assigned by the Pope; and then and there received, in the form of this document, the Indulgence itself with all its delivery from sin and temporal punishment, nothing else beyond this monetary transaction being required as a condition.¹

But to put it thus is to misrepresent the whole affair. Alms have always been held, in the Catholic Church, to be good works. "Prayer, fasting, and almsdeeds," says our present catechism, are "the three eminent good works." They can be solicited, therefore, for such spiritual ends as the defence of the Church against the destroyers of souls, for the building of churches, hospitals, &c., and they could be rewarded by Indulgences for the reasons already expounded. Moreover, in those days it was the custom to tax alms when any spiritual favour was to be given in return, so as to secure that the applicants gave a reasonable sum. This taxing took the form of a graduated scale—royal personages so much, nobles so much, merchants so much, knights, farmers, labourers, so much, in proportion to their presumed means, the very poor being required to give prayers instead of alms, and the confessors having always power to commute into lesser sums in the case of those unable to give according to their class. Nor were the sums asked for large enough to be in any way burdensome under ordinary circumstances. But, if this method of taxing was to prevail, it was necessary to take some means for securing its observance, and this was done by Indulgence Briefs. On paying in the alms, the contributor received one of these documents on which his name was inscribed, and which was also signed by the commissioner or sub-commissioner. This might be called buying and selling by ill-disposed persons, just as granting and accepting a benefice in consideration of spiritual work done may be, and often is, declared to be buying and selling. But the point to be considered is the motive which animated the external acts and the dispositions accompanying them; and, when the contributors and bestowers were spiritually minded, and kept well in mind the circumstances of the grant, almsgiving, not buying, is the proper term by which to describe the deed. Moreover, the possession thus obtained of the Indulgence Brief

¹ See Gerdes, *Monumenta Antiquitatis*, p. 73; Green's *Indulgences, Absolutions, Tax-tables*, p. 195.

was far from finishing the transaction. All it did was to qualify the recipient to receive the graces mentioned in the Brief, on fulfilment of the conditions annexed to each. Thus if it stated, as it invariably did, that the recipient must have confessed and communicated, and must make certain visits to churches, and say certain prayers, he must do these things, and then only when he had done them properly, could he assure himself that the Indulgence offered had been actually gained. Or, if it said, as it usually did, that he was given leave to choose a confessor who would then have power to absolve him from reserved cases, then, if he had committed sins the absolution of which was reserved, he must go to the confessor chosen (for ordinary confessors would not do), make his humble and contrite confession, accept a suitable sacramental penance, and then in the sacrament receive the absolution *a culpa*, and be in a position to gain the Plenary Indulgence properly so called. This is how the Indulgence Briefs are to be understood, and the most that can be said against them—though the Council of Trent, which abolished the method, thought this could be said against them—was that they were liable to be abused, when unworthy Indulgence-preachers subordinated all to the filling their money chests, and were not solicitous to see that the people were animated by right understanding and proper dispositions.

But what about Tetzel, Luther's antagonist in the first stage of the latter's heretical career, whom he succeeded in passing down to fame, or infamy, as the very type of a sacrilegious charlatan, unseemly, even shameless in his language, absolutely venal and unspiritual in his transactions. Here I would distinguish between Tetzel himself and that particular case of Indulgence-preaching. The Indulgence grant of Leo X. contained nothing which was not of the type of the Jubilee Indulgence I have described. But the transaction connected with it between Archbishop Albrecht of Mainz and the Fuggers was most scandalous, as perhaps were other things. Still that Tetzel was to blame is doubtful. I cannot now discuss all that the latest research has brought to light about him, but I am safe in saying that it tends to acquit him of the heavy charges brought against him by Luther. He vehemently denied the truth of these charges, and his Theses contrast very favourably with Luther's. The latter are a mass of hopeless confusion and misrepresentation of the Church's doctrine, which for my part I cannot but believe was deliberate. How could it be

otherwise when he had such sound expositions of it before him as those of his fellow-Augustinian, Palz? His Theses savour, too, of the recklessness and brutality of language which was so unpleasant a feature in their author's character. Tetzel's Theses, on the other hand, are clear and well ordered, on perfectly sound lines, and indicate what we cannot but feel were the real and innocent expressions which Luther transformed into expressions almost too revolting for any human being to have uttered. There is again in Tetzel's Theses an entire absence of abusive recriminations, and a dignity and reserve of language, together with a sense of deep feeling resolutely repressed, which is just what one looks for in a good and true man. It speaks in his favour, too, that he pined away under the weight of the accusations, and did not long survive them. A man of conscience would do that; a buffoon would not. Let me repeat, however, if Tetzel seems to have been at all events comparatively blameless, it must be freely admitted that the religious state of Germany at that time was shocking, and that it reacted on the administration of Indulgences. Only it must not be inferred that the people, at all events as a whole, was infected with false doctrine until Luther began to teach it. What happened was that princes and nobles forced their own nominees, and these had no true vocation to the clerical state, or sense of its responsibilities.

(c) *The Cruzada*.—For want of time I must pass over, but I may perhaps be permitted to name a little Catholic Truth Society's tract in which I have tried to explain that difficult subject.¹ Still, just this one observation. The system still prevailing in Spain, is substantially the same as that of the Indulgence Briefs of which we have just been speaking. The circumstances of that country at the time of the Council of Trent, together with the autocratic resistance to Papal schemes of reform offered by Philip II., made it impossible to introduce into Spain the changes made elsewhere. The Spanish system has, however, been gradually improved on its own lines, and purged of its defects, nor do I think that there is anything now left which could fairly be called a noxious abuse. Alms are indeed exacted in the Bulls, but they are too small to be felt, and the proceeds keep up the Church services.

(d) *The modern method of publication*.—But what were the changes made elsewhere? The Council of Trent took

¹ *Are Indulgences sold in Spain?*

the matter seriously in hand and, as we have seen, abolished altogether both Indulgence Briefs and the Indulgence Commissaries who went about dispensing them; and it introduced a difference in the mode of publication which has made commissioners no longer necessary. An Indulgence is now published at Rome and, in the more important cases, is announced by the Bishops to their own people, in Pastorals and otherwise. The people are then left to fulfil the prescribed conditions for themselves, either together in congregations, or separately as individuals; helped, however, just as in former days, by sermons and retreats, the giving of which is allotted to exceptionally qualified preachers. Alms are but seldom included among the prescribed conditions, but, if they are, there is no taxing. Boxes are placed in the churches, each person being left to settle with his own conscience, before his Maker, whether he gives with generosity or not. The opportunity of being absolved from reserved cases is still offered at Jubilees, but faculties are not now given through Indulgence Briefs. They are given generally to all approved confessors, or else to a large number of them, and people go to whom they will out of the choice left them. This system works smoothly and well, nor does it seem to offer much place for abuses.

5. *The easy conditions of modern Indulgences justified.*—We may now deal with a question already raised, the answer to which was held over till now. How are we to justify the transition from the hard system under which satisfaction for temporal punishment was exacted and accepted in the past with the inconceivably easy system under which it is exacted and accepted in the present day? To leave alone partial Indulgences, whereas so late as the twelfth century, to gain the sole Plenary Indulgence offered, it was necessary to go on a perilous Crusade, to-day, as the *Raccolta* shows, one can gain not one but several on the same day, on such easy conditions as, after Confession and Communion, to say a few short prayers. Can such an enormous mitigation of the discipline of the early Church be right? Must it not tend to relax those serious personal efforts and practices of self-mortification which are so necessary for the spiritual life, and to which just on that account the early Church trained the Christian people so resolutely and under such difficulties?

In dealing with this difficulty we had better begin by noticing that it rests not on any observed facts, but on an inference.

The mitigation, argues the objector, must have evil effects, therefore it does. It is true Dr. Lea indulges in profuse quotations to show that it does have that effect. But inasmuch as *more suo* he misunderstands his authorities, and besides mixes up bad with good, his quotations do not help us very much. Let us pass then to the inference. Now, I do not wish to underestimate the force of this inference, but before attempting to meet it I should like to put a question or two to those who find that in us Catholics the change is so scandalous. Take Dr. Lea, for instance. Does he subject himself to a penitential discipline like that of the primitive Church, or even like that of the early Middle Ages? Does he undertake public prostrations in sack-cloth and ashes, fastings, scourgings, and long prayers, and does he prolong them through many years that there may be at least some proportion between them and the gravity of the sins with which his conscience reproaches him? I doubt it, yet if he does not, by what title can he claim to take scandal at us who, whatever our declension from the severities of our remote ancestors, have at all events not declined from them so far as he? If our lives are scandalous for doing so little, must not his be scandalous for doing so much less? And this consideration suggests a way of regarding the subject which members of the Guild will be able to appreciate. In the Anglican Communion Service a return to that ancient discipline is spoken of as a thing "which is much to be wished," and a similar wish was expressed by some of the Fathers of Trent, yet in neither case, nor in the case of any other religious communion, has such a return been attempted. Why not? Does any one think it would be practical, does any one think it would lead, in the balance of advantage or disadvantage, to a preponderance of good over evil results? No prudent person, I fancy, would say, for good; and that is the situation which the Holy See has to confront, that or its previous counterparts in the course of previous history. Let it be granted that a progressive decay of fervour is what has changed the situation, still the situation has been changed, and it is surely wiser to deal with it as it is, and make the best of it, than to impose systems which can no longer work for good, for the mere sake of preserving an iron rule of uniformity with the past. Systems are for men, not men for systems. But let me also suggest a reflection of a somewhat different kind. Granted that the situation present to the Church at the time is that which she

must deal with and make the best of, yet is it so certain that the situations have changed steadily in the sense of a continuous falling-off of fervour? Of course there have been ups and downs, some ages being better and others worse, just as the surface of the ocean changes. But, just as the depths of the ocean remain unchanged beneath the surface ruffings, does not human nature remain throughout in its depths substantially the same? It is difficult, nay, impossible, to think that in the Primitive Church more than a fraction of the sinners submitted themselves to that stern discipline of canonical penance, and the same may be said of the early Middle Ages when the public humiliations were discontinued, but the penitential tariffs were still severe. Those who did submit themselves would seem to have been the *élite* among the sinners desirous to repent. What then happened to the rest? It would seem that, too weak to face the severities of penitential discipline, they remained outside, just as people often now-a-days, though they would like to return to God's grace, shrink from the ordeals and the sacrifices which return entails; or, to take a parallel from the past, just as people used to put off their baptism till late in life, or the hour of death, because the "second plank" of salvation was made so difficult. True, what is according to the law of Christ essential for the restoration of the sinner, the Church can on no account whatever surrender, but she has learnt from her Master not to break the bruised reed or quench the smoking flax, and we can understand her, in presence of the tendency I have just referred to, asking herself how she might devise a means by which still to stimulate the generosity of select souls, without discouraging the timid longings of the weaker souls. And to this it would seem that she has been tending in all her gradual transformation of a penitential into an Indulgence system.

Let me apply this principle to the age in which we are living: and in applying it let me be allowed to speak from an experience of the present which one can have in its fulness only when one has lived and worked for long in the sacred ministry, but in terms which I am sure my colleagues in the priesthood would endorse. Comparing the present with the early ages of the Catholic Church—and leaving out of account those great Fathers and Saints who are not so much the fruit of their age, as gifts which God's Providence sprinkles over the various ages as He wills—I ask myself is there now

any serious falling off from what there was of old? I do not, honestly, think there is. On the contrary, in a very real sense I think there is an improvement. There are still select souls, in varying degrees of perfection, who display the greatest generosity in God's service, and, whilst most solicitous to gain the full fruit of Holy Indulgences, are also most diligent and often heroic in their works of penance and self-discipline. And here I may remark incidentally that I never knew or heard of a Catholic who reasoned that because he could gain Indulgences he need not trouble about self-mortification. To an *a priori* reasoner that might seem to be the way in which the system would work, but in fact the devout people who strive to gain Indulgences regard them as a supplement to their own weakness in satisfying for themselves and for their dead friends. Besides, they have other motives for leading a penitential life, namely, that they may overcome their evil propensities and defects of character, and that they may imitate our Lord Jesus Christ and not be the "delicate members of a body whose Head is thorn-crowned." But, to return from the digression, there are those who in varying degrees are less fervent, or less consistently fervent, just as there were in the early Christian centuries. And those who, had they lived in those past times, would probably have shrunk from undertaking penances so disproportioned to their weakness of disposition, are now by the incentive of Indulgences won oftentimes to the conditions for gaining them, to prayer, confession, and Communion, and so have their religious impressions revived or sustained, and often deepened, with manifest good to their souls—as happens so regularly in times of grace, like Lent or mission time. Here, too, comes in the justification of the immense number of modern Indulgences, even plenary ones. Whilst allowing in their variety for the differences of circumstance, capability, and devotion, they are like sign-posts pointing the way to all the different modes of prayer and action which go to constitute a truly Christian life. Follow these indications in the spirit which they claim from you, and you will find that you are walking before God and striving after perfection.

But it is time to end, which I will do after putting very concisely indeed, by way of objection and reply, two points which seem needed to complete this explanation of the influence of Indulgences on the spiritual life.

(1) Does not the suggestion made that the mediæval and

modern Church discontinued the system of severe penances because it was bad for the many, cast a stigma on the Primitive Church for not having done so sooner? I think not. The Church must feel her way from step to step, which she does by dealing with present exigencies as they confront her, and leaving ulterior developments to the foresight of the Holy Spirit who guides her. And in the commencement she was manifestly impressed by the importance of forming her children to an adequate conception of the gravity of sin. Later, when that lesson was sufficiently learnt, she might pass on to enforce other aspects of the Christian life. The analogy of what our missionaries to the heathen still find it necessary to do is in support of this view of the case. For they find it necessary to keep their native converts for a very long time, often for years, in the condition of catechumens, that they may learn to realize the nature and claims of the Christian life. And this, in spite of the enormous importance they attach to the reception of Holy Baptism.

(2) Is it not recognized that there should be some proportion between the causes for which an Indulgence is granted, and the amplitude of the grant? How can it be right to grant Plenary Indulgences (not to speak of others), on conditions so light and easy as the recitation of short prayers? To this the answer is that the importance of the cause is to be measured, not merely by the seriousness of the effort imposed, but also by the accession of glory to God and of spiritual welfare to the Christian people, which the good works prescribed as conditions are calculated to promote, when performed with fervour and regularity by so many persons. And that they are calculated to yield these fruits, and do produce them, has been sufficiently shown already.

S. F. S.

Brother Rufino.

BROTHER RUFINO was pacing the cloisters of the ancient Franciscan Convent of Casciano. He was reading his breviary. His tall figure lay like a black shadow athwart the vivid sunlight. Brother Rufino was very young: he had a face like St. Martin in Holbein's Madonna, at Solothurn; and he had a vocation. He was a foundling and had been brought up within the shadow of the monastery. As a child, when he had served at the Mass, in his scarlet cassock, and had swung the censer before the altar, he had dreamed of the Cherubim around the throne. In boyhood, his abiding thought had been of that greatest moment of his life, when he should make his First Communion. All through his youth, every day, every hour, was preparation for that day when he should take his final vows. Only one regret ruffled the passionate peace of his soul: it was not to be his, the privilege of sacrifice. To him, the convent precincts seemed the very threshold of Heaven, and to spend his life in perpetual adoration but the realization of the love that burnt like a white flame in his heart. The Brothers regarded him as a recipient of the special grace of God: they even whispered of the day when the convent might be glorified by the memory of "Blessed Rufino," or even perchance "St. Rufino." Could St. Francis himself have had a purer spirit?

It was now five years since Brother Rufino had first donned the robe of the novice. Surely he had kept it unspotted through his boyhood's years. It was but three days ago that, on the feast of Pentecost, he had entered for ever the Order of St. Francis, under the name of that Saint of whom St. Francis said, "He is one of the holiest souls God has in all the earth,"—a name which his humility would have rejected, but which all the Brothers forced upon him.

"*Secundum misericordiam tuam vivifica me,*" read Brother Rufino.

Each successive archway of the cloister presented a picture, framed in grey stone, of the tiny garden, where roses and dusty snapdragons and lilies of every hue rioted in rich luxuriance, and filled the air with their fragrance: the bees hummed drowsily in the heavy sunshine, and butterflies fluttered, capricious, from flower to flower.

"Lucerna pedibus meis verbum tuum et lumen semitis meis."

Brother Rufino found his thoughts wandering, and his eyes gazing into the garden. He started, made an act of contrition, and began again.

"Haereditate acquisivi testimonia tua in aeternum quia exultatio cordis mei sunt."

Finally he raised his head and sighed. Something in the sunshine and fragrance and murmur of the bees moved him strangely. Never did he recollect having so much trouble with wandering thoughts.

A bell rang and startled the silence. There were probably visitors to see over the chapel. Old Brother Bernard who usually acted as guide was ill, and the task fell to Brother Rufino. He passed by the little door that led from the cloister into the east end of the church. It struck cold and dark. It was a big, ugly building of basilica form. The side chapels were adorned with paintings more or less crude. Over the high altar was a smoky-looking picture, in the style of the sixteenth century, of St. Francis receiving the stigmata, and round it the legend, *Mihi absit gloriari nisi in cruce Domini.*

Brother Rufino knelt a moment on the steps of the chancel, and then passed down the aisle towards the west door. He became aware of steps approaching: someone must already have opened the door, and he raised his bent head and stood transfixed. Through the small, high windows of the south side of the church the sunlight streamed and lay in circles of light on the pavement. Bathed in the radiance of a shaft of light stood a young girl. She was in white and very fair: her face had scarcely lost its childish curves: the deep blue eyes, unclouded, childlike and serene, were fixed inquiringly on the unexpected figure before her.

"Surely," thought Brother Rufino, "the Blessed Virgin was no other than this as she walked among the lilies in the garden of Nazareth, ere she had seen the shining feet of the Angel of the Annunciation." Brother Rufino awoke from his vision as a

soft voice, in uncertain Italian, asked if it were possible to see the church.

"There is nothing to see but the carvings in the choir: will the signorina walk this way?"

The girl had only been in Italy two days: it was the first time she had been beyond twenty miles of the almost conventual seclusion of her English home—and she had never seen a monk.

As they passed up the aisle together she glanced at the figure beside her. But Brother Rufino, though he had not been outside the convent walls since he was fourteen, knew, theoretically, that it was dangerous to look at a woman; so the girl saw nothing but the bent profile of his face.

When they reached the chancel steps Brother Rufino once more knelt down and crossed himself. The girl watched him with a mixture of awe and curiosity. The latter triumphed.

"Why do you do that?" she asked gently. Brother Rufino was surprised into raising his head. He had never met a heretic.

"The signorina is not a Catholic?" he asked, with infinite pity in his voice and eyes.

"No," she answered, her interest further stimulated. She had a fixed belief that Catholics were idolaters and that all monks were wicked. "This one has such a beautiful face," she thought, "I'm sure he's not wicked."

She was still speculating on the unexpected qualities of Brother Rufino when they reached the carvings which ran all round the apse. There was a story among the brethren of the Convent of Casciano of a certain Brother Giles who had been one of their number in the early days of the fifteenth century. Brother Giles had lain in a trance three days and three nights. When he awoke, he told how he had seen, in a vision, the whole life of St. Francis unfolded before him, and that he had been bidden to tell the story in carved wood. When finished, it was to adorn the apse of the church whose foundations were only then appearing above the ground.

Brother Giles was a true disciple of the St. Francis who had written the "Hymn to the Sun" and called the birds his sisters. Month after month, as the seasons came and went, Brother Giles toiled faithfully to reveal the vision that was in him. The very atmosphere of the Umbrian land breathes forth from the now darkening oak, wrought with such loving care into far-folded hills and drifting clouds, into flowery plains traversed by rippling

waters, into great trees where for ever flutter delicately plumed birds. And in each landscape there passes the frail form of the Saint like a perpetual benediction.

Brother Rufino passed from picture to picture and told the girl the story of St. Francis and his love to all men and creatures, of his visions, of his renunciations.

There was some strange trouble in Brother Rufino's heart this morning. Was it joy? Was it pain? Was it sin? It was as if something were welling up in his heart: it was like the opening of a rose in ecstasy at the touch of the sun: like the quivering of a nestling's wings: like the first notes of the birds in the stillness of the dawn. It brought a strange wistfulness into his voice and words of unwonted beauty to his lips. And all the while, unconsciously to himself, but pervading his whole being, was the question, felt for the first time—was his life after all to be a great renunciation?

As he told the tale there dawned on the childlike spirit of the girl the light of a revelation, and it transfigured her face with a strange beauty, and Brother Rufino looked and marvelled.

"And was St. Francis really a Roman Catholic?" she asked, as they passed down the church to the west door. "I thought they were superstitious idolaters?"

Brother Rufino looked at her. To think that so beautiful a soul should be in utter darkness! He was not even quite sure she could be saved. The question of heretics had not come under his notice before: their case was more hopeless than that of sinners.

"Signorina," he said, "will you tell me your name, that I may remember it in my prayers?"

"Eve," she answered.

"Ah," said Brother Rufino, "Eve."

"Yes, after my grandmother," she said.

Brother Rufino was still pondering deeply. Perhaps if he could get Eve to say a prayer to the Virgin, the Madonna might intercede for her. He had a little card in the leaves of his breviary. On one side was the picture of the Madonna and Child, on the other the words of the old Catholic prayer *Salve Regina, Mater Misericordiae*.

"Will the signorina say over these words every day?" said Brother Rufino.

Eve did not like to refuse: to consent would perhaps be a little atonement for the mental injustice she had done Catholics all these years.

"Thank you," she said gently, "I will."

Their fingers met as she took the card. Brother Rufino drew his hand quickly away.

"And what is your name?" asked Eve.

"Brother Rufino, after the Blessed Rufino," he answered.

"But your other name," she said, "your family name?"

"We have no other name, signorina: we are brothers of St. Francis in Christ; we have renounced the world: we have no one belonging to us."

A wave of pity swept over Eve. She strove to read the monk's resolute face, as his deep ringing tones woke echoes in the empty church. Was it an exalted vision of things unseen? Was it regret? Was it mere human loneliness? Eve's spirit seemed to have awakened since she came into the church this morning: she dimly descried something of the mystery of life.

They had reached the west door.

"Good-bye: thank you," said Eve.

The monk flung open the west door, and Eve passed out into the glowing sunshine. Darkness fell again upon the church as Brother Rufino bolted the door and leant against it motionless, with his head buried on his folded arms.

As Brother Rufino returned up the church he passed the shrine of the Virgin and Child.

To her he had vowed a special devotion. When his heart was filled with Divine love that mortal frame could scarce endure, he was wont to kneel before her. In his moments of passionate aspiration it had sometimes seemed to him that the Divine Mother had stepped down from her shrine and enfolded him in her arms, and that the Child she bore in her arms had touched his brow in benediction. And he had arisen from his knees, and departed—satisfied. Once again, in this strange new tumult of his soul, he came to the Madonna for comfort and peace. He laid his brow upon the iron rail, and stretched out his hands in supplication.

*Sancta Dei Genitrix,
Sancta Virgo Virginum,
Mater Christi,
Ora pro nobis.*

The speechless pain of his soul found utterance insensibly in the familiar words of the Litany of the Virgin.

There was no sign—no peace. Again he murmured, half unconscious,

*Stella Matutina,
Salus Infirmorum,
Refugium peccatorum,
Ora pro nobis.*

Yes : she had heard his prayer : she was bending forward to enfold him in her arms : he waited — breathless with ecstasy : but it was the face of Eve that leaned towards his, and smiled, and Eve who held out to him the child in her arms.

The cold sweat broke out upon his brow.

Refugium peccatorum, ora pro nobis—Refugium peccatorum—Refugium peccatorum.

Over and over again he stammered the words incoherently. He lifted up his eyes, feign to banish the obsession by gazing on the divine loveliness of the Madonna and Child. And he saw a simpering figure, dressed in frayed silk with a tarnished tinsel crown ; in her arms was a wax doll in a soiled satin dress holding a ball in its hand.

Brother Rufino staggered out of the church like a drunken man.

A touch on a button will launch a battleship : among the Alpine snows a whisper will sometimes bring down an avalanche. For Brother Rufino, a commonplace little English girl had served to awaken to sudden life all the complex forces of his being. And this unknown self turned and leapt upon him, and clutched him by the throat as a wild beast springs suddenly upon an unwary traveller. That other world of vision and ecstasy seemed as vain a thing as a shadow dispersed by the sun. His way of life,—negation of self, humiliation of body, discipline of mind and spirit—seemed but a purposeless pain, and his whole being clamoured fiercely for satisfaction of self :—for life far away from this sleep-locked cloister,—for life among men who were not shadows, for life with its strenuous doing and passionate love.

All night long Brother Rufino lay at the foot of the great crucifix that hung on the wall of his cell. The mellow light of the full moon streamed on the ivory Christ, from whose tortured Brow and Hands and Feet the Blood was streaming. Without,

the full-throated song of the nightingales was throbbing in the cypress trees, and the scent of the lilies hung heavy in the night air.

Brother Rufino had the fighting spirit, as well as the face of the warrior saint.

Through peaceful years he had been girding on his armour and in the first shock of battle he might reel but not fall.

Through boyhood and youth he had followed, as closely as a man may, the pattern he had set before him. Hitherto, he had stood on the Mountain of Thabor, and whoever has once seen the light of the Transfiguration, cannot utterly fail in the day of the Crucifixion.

ETHEL ROSS BARKER.

Flotsam and Jetsam.

De l'Audace!

MASTERS of the Art of War have ever understood the supreme importance of putting on a bold front, even when actual conditions do not appear to justify it. It is no less evident that in polemics and controversy of all kinds, there is nothing like a good round assertion or statement for making an impression on the multitude of men, even though little or no consideration would be sufficient to show that it is absolutely baseless, or even absurd. A well-known Irish politician of the last generation was said to boast that he had secured election by promising to make Athlone a seaport town, though it is situated not far from the centre of the island; and lawyers of experience have been known to advise one who has run into another's vehicle on the road, to bring an action at once against his victim, jurymen being prone to start with the assumption that the plaintiff is more likely to be in the right than the defendant.

To judge by certain recent examples, the militant apostles of rationalism seem to have fully realized this truth, and to have no scruple in attempting to secure the tactical advantage which belongs to such as are not ashamed to avail themselves of popular ignorance in the name of scientific enlightenment.

A signal instance was afforded the other day in a public discussion between a prominent agent of the rationalistic propaganda and an Anglican clergyman, on which occasion the former made, amongst others, two very remarkable statements.

He declared, in the first place, that between 1815 and 1870, during which period religion was taught in French schools, juvenile crime was far more frequent than it now is, having decreased by 25% since religion was banished from the schools at the latter date.

Now, to omit other remarks which might be made, as that previously to 1826 there are no returns from which to speak, it is abundantly clear that the facts are exactly contrary to his

statement. No French writer of any authority or any party, attempts to deny the appalling *increase* of juvenile crime in recent years. The only question raised is concerning the cause.

C'est un lieu commun [writes Max Turmann¹] que de déplorer l'accroissement rapide et terrifiant de la criminalité juvénile. . . . Lisez les *Faits divers* des journaux, et vous serez effrayé du nombre des crimes commis par des "apaches" de quinze à vingt ans. Ces meurtres et ces méfaits de toutes sortes, dont la presse nous apporte chaque jour le récit, laissent entrevoir à quel point le sens moral est atrophié chez tous ces malheureux.

The other confident statement to which we have referred is that in pagan Rome physicians were provided by the State for the benefit of the poor; that it was Christianity which abolished this custom, and threw the burden upon private munificence; and that to this foolish alteration a vast amount of misery is directly due.

This is a good example of what seems to be a very common assumption that when a statement has been made it is entitled to be considered true, till some positive evidence is brought to prove that it is false. It appears to be far too frequently forgotten that the burden of proof lies upon him who makes the statement, and that until he supports his case by something in the way of evidence, he cannot expect anyone to spend time and trouble in the thankless task of endeavouring to prove a negative. What do we hear from Roman authors of State physicians, provided for the benefit of the poor? But those who know nothing of Roman literature will be deeply impressed by so bold an assertion, and the more deeply in proportion as they are more ignorant.

J. G.

Hebrew Poetry.

In illustration of his contention that the observance of the laws of literary structure in printing the Bible may often be an aid to its clearer interpretation, Professor R. G. Moulton, to whose work—*The Literary Study of the Bible*—we called attention last month, instances the *Our Father*. This, arranged as an "Envelope Figure" thus,

Our Father, who art in heaven;
Hallowed be thy name,
Thy kingdom come,
Thy will be done,
On earth as it is in heaven—

¹ *Activités Sociales*, p. 363.

makes evident that the last clause qualifies the three preceding, and thus gives a fuller meaning to the whole. A writer in the *Ave Maria* points out that the *Hail Mary* in like manner, though a composition made up of several separate utterances, also shows the influence of the "parallel" idea. The two notions of (1) sanctity and (2) maternity are emphasized by a triple reflection, thus :

Hail Mary !

- | | |
|----------------------------|--|
| (1) Full of grace, | Blessed art thou among women, Holy Mary; |
| (2) The Lord is with thee, | Blessed is the fruit of thy womb, Jesus. |
| | Mother of God, |
| | Pray for us sinners, etc. |

A "Birrellism" worth preserving.

Mr. Birrell, in charge of the Irish University Bill, is an altogether different person from the Mr. Birrell who tried to force upon us, against his own better judgment, we may hope, the Education Bill of 1906. Then, his attitude was expressed by the cynical phrase—Minorities must suffer: now, he utters words of truth and justice, which, though they embody nothing new, are remarkable as a frank recognition of facts from the Treasury Bench. On closing the debate on the second reading of the Bill, on May 11th, the Irish Secretary said :

I cannot pretend to say what the future of these universities will be, but really some people talk as if Catholics had nothing to do with learning, and as if a learned Catholic hardly ever existed. We Protestants have succeeded to Catholic institutions. For long centuries we have enjoyed our education in the colleges founded by the William of Wykehams, the Lady Margarets, and other Catholics. For long we banged the doors of those places in the face of people who belonged to the same faith as the founders. We benefited by the education provided by Catholics; we enjoyed their literature; and many of us are still brought up in some subjects under their influences. And yet some of us have the audacity to pretend that education will be endangered, and that a University will not be a true seat of learning, if Catholics have a predominant influence on the governing body. I repudiate that from the bottom of my heart.

Mr. Birrell, who is nothing if not literary, may have had in mind the words uttered by T. B. Macaulay on a somewhat similar occasion, viz., when the House of Commons was

debating Sir Robert Peel's Maynooth Bill in April, 1845. Macaulay thus delivered himself on the subject of the Grant :

It is, I must say, with a peculiarly bad grace that one of the members for the University [Cambridge] to which I have the honour to belong, a gentleman who never thought himself bound to say a word or to give a vote against the grant of £9,000, now vehemently opposes the grant of £26,000 as exorbitant. When I consider how munificently the colleges of Cambridge and Oxford are endowed, and with what pomp religion and learning are there surrounded ; when I call to mind the long streets of palaces, the towers and oriels, the venerable cloisters, the trim gardens, the organs, the altar-pieces, the solemn light of the stained windows, the libraries, the museums, the galleries of painting and sculpture, when I call to mind also the physical comforts which are provided both for instructors and for pupils . . . and when I remember from whom all this splendour and plenty is derived, when I remember what was the faith of Edward III. and of Henry VI., of Margaret of Anjou and Margaret of Richmond, of William of Wykeham and William of Waynfleet, of Archbishop Chicheley and Cardinal Wolsey, when I remember what we have taken from the Roman Catholics,—King's College, New College, Christ Church, my own Trinity, and when I look at the miserable "Dotheboys Hall" which we have given them in exchange, I feel, I must own, less proud than I could wish of being a Protestant and a Cambridge man.

That is a reproach which the present member for Cambridge, despite his efforts to exclude Maynooth, except under impossible conditions, from the coming University, may well hold himself free.

"Anglicanists."

It will be seen from the above extracts that neither the orator of 1845, nor the statesman of 1908, is under any illusion as to what happened at the Reformation. The Elizabethan settlement which soon developed, as Macaulay himself said, "into a hundred sects battling within one church" was not the old Catholic Church with its face washed, but something radically different. But as is well known, many modern Anglicans refuse to recognize the fact, and arrogate to themselves the title of Catholics, whilst those to whom the title of right belongs, are styled "Romanists," or, more correctly but still discourteously, "Papist Dissenters." Well, we are Dissenters from the Church Established, and the name Papist might well be an honourable, as it is a true, designation, but the word "Romanist" is much less appropriate to us than a

corresponding formation, "Anglicanist," would be to them. For they *are* Anglicanists first, last, and altogether, and the nearest approach to Catholicity they can make is to become Pan-Anglicanists. There are two main sects even amongst these extremists. There are those who frankly desire union with Rome, who have been wittily described as "men who believe all the Pope utters except when he says he is right," and there are our old friends, the Branch-Church Theorists. It is generally the latter who feel it necessary to emphasize their contention by the use of the offensive title "Romanist." We must own they have the courage of their convictions. If they are right, then we *are* members of an intrusive Italian mission, just as "Bishop" Cabrera represents an intrusive Anglican mission in Spain. But it is no less certain that the detailed application of those convictions leads sometimes to grotesque results. For instance, the *Church Times* for May 8th, after noticing the reported consecration of a certain A. H. Mathew, by some schismatic Bishops, delivers itself of the following extraordinary reflections.¹

It is a somewhat difficult matter for us to discuss such a delicate question as this of a breach within the Roman communion.² What we have some justification for commenting upon, is the addition of yet another to the many religious communions in England, *which deliberately range themselves outside the Catholic Church of the country.* These Old Catholics, however, have just as much, or as little, to say for themselves and their anomalous position as the Romanists with whom they are now parting company. It may be, and we sincerely trust it will be, that some day they *will submit themselves to the Episcopate of these provinces*, recognizing the impossibility, on Catholic principles, of there being a rival Episcopate, still less of there being two rival Episcopates, in the same country. There would have been something to say in favour of a plan by means of which the seceding congregations might, in communion with the Catholic Church of England, [*i.e.* the Anglican Church] and under proper sanction, have continued to worship with their Latin rites. As it is, they have simply added to "our unhappy divisions."

Mr. Belloc might have written thus, in his most mordant mood: it breathes the very spirit of *Mr. Burden*. And it certainly ought to be included in the next edition of the "Prig's" *Black is White, or Continuity Continued*.

J. K.

¹ Italics ours.

² Mr. Mathew is treated throughout as a noun of multitude. His going into schism is called a "breach within the Roman communion." Lower down, he becomes "these Old Catholics," and, further on, several "seceding congregations." There is a trace here of the wish being father to the thought.

Reviews.

I.—THE BACONIAN PHILOSOPHY.¹

THIS *brochure* is a symptom of the reaction naturally produced by the extravagant pretensions so often and so unscientifically advanced on behalf of what is styled the Baconian philosophy, as though its author first taught men how to think, or even how to employ the inductive method. There has undoubtedly been much wild talk on the subject, in disparagement of the deductive argumentation of the medieval Schoolmen, but it would be a great mistake to ignore on that account the great benefit which, especially in the field of natural science, has resulted from the general employment of the inductive method; nor should it be denied that, previously to its adoption, argumentation was too often based, as Newman says, "upon dictatorial formulæ, the effect of which was to change Physics into a deductive science, and to oblige the student to assume implicitly, as first principles, enunciations and maxims, which were venerable, only because no one could tell whence they came, and authoritative, only because no one could say what arguments there were in their favour."²

We cannot but think that Father Hogan falls into this mistake when, in his desire to vindicate the memory of the Scholastics, he would refuse to Bacon and his school all credit whatever for the mode of reasoning which they employ.

Nowhere perhaps [he writes³] does Lord Bacon give us so full an insight into his true mental character as when he decides to "reject the syllogism and make use of induction for both the major and the minor propositions." This is equivalently a resolve to use observed facts, and nothing but observed facts, as a medium of inference in deducing physical laws. But the "father of physical science" did not see that no accumulation of facts, however extensive, used as premisses, can ever warrant a universal conclusion, and that *without a universal*

¹ Lord Bacon *v.* Scholastic Philosophy: by Rev. Michael Hogan, S.J. Pp. 40. New York: The Catholic World Press. (Reprinted from *The Messenger*, December, 1906, and *The Catholic World*, March, 1908.)

² *Idea of a University*, p. 444.

³ P. 21.

*conclusion there can be no law and consequently no science.*¹ One may have seen a stone fall to the earth ten thousand times under the influence of gravity, but these ten thousand instances can of themselves give him no assurance that the same will happen the next time and every time that the stone finds itself in mid-air. Yet without such an assurance his knowledge is in no sense scientific. . . . In order that a universal law may be legitimately inferred from any number of observed facts, the general principle known as the uniformity of Nature must enter into the reasoning. . . . To establish the existence of this law is the work of metaphysics.

All this, we must confess, appears to us entirely beside the mark. Neither Bacon, nor any other philosopher, ever supposed that a mere accumulation of facts—as they might be witnessed by a dog or a horse—could furnish any foundation upon which to base an argument. But, as observed by rational men, they necessarily suggest inferences amply sufficient for the purpose. If I see a man throw aces a hundred times running with a pair of dice and confidently anticipate that he will do the same again the hundred and first, this is not because aces have happened to turn up so frequently, but because I conclude without hesitation that the dice are loaded, and the same effect will follow the same cause.

This is unquestionably the principle upon which Bacon and his school proceed. From what they witness in the operations of nature they infer a law of uniformity, as from the particular behaviour of unsupported stones we infer the law of gravitation, which is in reality but a generalized statement of observed facts. These laws are simply inductive inferences, based entirely on the observation of individual occurrences, and therefore, according to Father Hogan's contention, they are incapable of sustaining a scientific conclusion. To call them "laws" is to add nothing to their potency, which, under whatever name, is due to Induction alone. We may, indeed, maintain, with such a philosopher as Professor Jevons, that such premisses as they furnish can lead to no more than a probable conclusion, or at best can afford physical but not absolute certainty.² But in any case, whatever it may be, it is all that is within our reach, in concrete matters wherewith physical science deals. It must be added that it amply satisfies the requirements of reason—always assuming the method of induction to be rightly employed.

¹ The italics are Father Hogan's.

² Father R. F. Clarke, *Logic*, p. 399.

It is only because they do not rightly employ it that so many of our modern philosophers go astray, not from any inherent vice in the inductive method itself; and it is undeniable that the use of the deductive method led to fatal and flagrant error in the hands of those who would base physical conclusions on premisses obtained otherwise than by observation and experiment.

Bacon is no doubt by no means a favourable exponent of what is styled his own system, not only because of his shortcomings in the matter of mathematical and scientific knowledge, but because of the faulty manner in which he so frequently expressed himself. It is, we believe, mainly by such defective expression of his real meaning that he has laid himself open to the charge brought against him by Father Hogan.

We must also demur to the rather sweeping attack made by our author on scientific men in general, as if the effect of Baconian philosophy was to make them all unbelievers. It is no doubt a lamentable fact that many men of science are rationalists or agnostics, but here as elsewhere, care should be taken to avoid exaggeration and overstatement, and Father Hogan seems rather too ready to accept stories of this kind on very insufficient evidence. To cite but one example, he repeats the old tale of Laplace and his atheistic reply to Napoleon, which two months ago¹ we had occasion to mention as a specimen of the legends frequently repeated which will not bear closer examination.

2.—THE ENGLISH MARTYRS.²

The two volumes mentioned below are connected not only through their subject-matter but also from the fact that they both owe their appearance to the indefatigable zeal and industry of Father John Hungerford Pollen, S.J., the Postulator of the cause of the English Martyrs. To take the smaller volume first, it is reprinted from a rare, probably unique, copy

¹ THE MONTH, May, 1908, p. 482.

² Unpublished Documents relating to the English Martyrs, Vol. i. 1584—1603, edited by Father J. H. Pollen, S.J. (being the Fifth Volume issued by the Catholic Record Society). Privately Printed. Pp. xvi. 422. 1908.

The Martyrdom of Father Edmund Campion and his Companions. By William Cardinal Allen. Edited by Father J. H. Pollen, S.J. London: Burns and Oates. Pp. xxi. 140. Price, 4s. net. 1908.

of Allen's original edition in the British Museum, and gives in simple but very moving style the story of the last moments of Blessed Edmund Campion and fourteen others who suffered martyrdom about the same time. As Cardinal Allen himself wrote to a friend :

You will see in [my book] a constancy quite equal to that of the ancient martyrs. Their fortitude has marvellously moved and changed all hearts. Men of good will and moderation are repentant, the wicked and the enemies are amazed. Loud, indeed, is the cry of sacred blood so copiously shed. Ten thousand sermons would not have published our apostolic faith and religion so winningly as the fragrance of these victims, most sweet both to God and to men.

Father Pollen points out in his Introduction the singular fact that no less than ten of these glorious martyrs were Oxford men, showing how deep-rooted the Old Faith was in that University. He also calls our attention to the whole process of martyrdom as illustrated by the details of these several Acts. At the end of the volume are reproduced the six rough drawings which appeared in the first Italian version of the book, describing the usual course of sufferings undergone by martyrs in England.

The Record Society volume is wholly taken up with documents concerning those lesser-known English martyrs who have not yet been beatified. It will be remembered that the sixty-three martyrs, whose pictures were painted with the Papal approval on the walls of the church of the English College, Rome, in 1584, were on that account admitted with less difficulty and delay to the honours of Beatification. Consequently, a good deal more is known and has been published about them than about their equally heroic colleagues who suffered subsequently. This indicates the great value and interest of Father Pollen's large collection, which brings together as materials for history a variety of papers hitherto unpublished from different public and private archives and other sources. The result is a series of vivid pen-pictures of the horrors and glories of the penal days.

No one [says the editor] who does not try to make such a comparison [sc. between the descriptions of the various martyrs' careers] will believe the deep impression produced by the multitude of witnesses, some speaking with the boundless enthusiasm of spiritual admirers, some with the incredible malignity of religious persecutors, some with the cold stiffness of officials, some with the fire of poets, some with the

tenderness of brothers, or the delicate precision of scholars, or the honest bluntness of the uneducated, yet all in effect attesting the same facts, telling substantially the same story, and pointing the same moral.

To a book of this sort a good Index is an indispensable necessity: that furnished by Miss Stearn is both full and accurate.

The story thus told and the moral thus conveyed are such as will interest the large number of candid Protestants who have come to recognize that current Reformation history is above all "a conspiracy against the truth." But Catholics especially, in these easy-going times will here be reminded how precious is that faith which they hold at such little cost, but for which their ancestors willingly bartered wealth and fame and life.

We heartily congratulate the Catholic Record Society, which is now just four years old, on the excellent work it is doing, and are glad that the growth of membership allows a prospect of increase in the annual output, already so creditable.

3.—THE ORIGINS OF THE ANGLICAN SCHISM.¹

The *Bibliothèque de l'Enseignement de l'Histoire ecclésiastique* is now in the eleventh year of its existence. It was projected in response to the wish expressed by Leo XIII. that a universal ecclesiastical history might be gradually elaborated on lines in keeping with the critical results and principles of modern research. Such an undertaking to be satisfactorily carried out requires an immense amount of preliminary and departmental labour, and that is what this *Bibliothèque* aims at supplying in some measure. Over twenty handy little volumes, of the sort suitable for the professors and students who require to have their facts carefully explored and documented, have already been published, and, embracing as they do many periods and aspects of Church history, are a valuable addition to our libraries. M. Trésal takes up a subject which relates to this country, but is primarily intended for French readers, who of late years have learnt to take a special interest in English religious controversies.

The author's object is to show by what course of thought

¹ *Les Origines du Schisme Anglican (1509—1571)*. Par J. Trésal. Paris: Victor Lecoffre. Pp. xiv. 250. Price, 5 fr. 1908.

and what succession of events a whole country, which for centuries had been devotedly Catholic, was in a few short decades so entirely changed that it came to take its place in the world at the head of the Protestant Revolution. Faithful to the modern method of tracing results to their ultimate causes, he begins his narrative as far back as the fourteenth century with the outbreak of Wiclif. Perhaps he attributes too much to Wiclif's direct influence on the nation. Still, it is unquestionable that indirectly, through the influence of that heresiarch on the Hussites of Bohemia, and thence on Luther and his followers in Germany, he had claims to be regarded as the Father of the Reformation. Whether the author has rightly understood the objects set before themselves by the "Oxford Reformers," Colet, Erasmus, and More, may be doubted; for it seems unlikely that More wished to see his Utopia realized in the actual life of his own country, or that either he or Colet (what Erasmus wished in his heart of hearts does not matter) would have accepted such a nineteenth century ideal as the author ascribes to them when he writes—"They wished to reanimate and purify Christendom; and they thought the best way of attaining this result was by liberty of thought, free research, toleration and rational education taking the place of scholasticism. They dreamt of a broad Church, disengaged from all disputes about dogma, reuniting the Christian populations in one vast and fraternal community." These, however, are points of detail. On the whole the author has estimated justly the causes and complications which led to the separation of England from the Holy See, and the gradual rise of heresy as well as schism to the posts of influence in the kingdom; the character of the men who wrought the destruction, and the motives by which they were actuated; the attachment of the people generally to their old faith, and the mode by which they were terrorized gradually into a reluctant external submission to the changes of doctrine and worship. As his narrative stops at the year 1571 with St. Pius V.'s Bull of Excommunication when, as he considers, the final breach between the two Churches was accomplished, it does not fall within his scope to deal with the last stage of the transformation. Otherwise he would have had to show that the real passage of the nation from Catholic to Protestant, to the Protestantism of internal attachment as distinguished from that of external compliance, was not effected till much later, and was a

gradual process, depending chiefly on the rise of newer generations which had never known Catholicism in itself, but only in the caricature of misrepresentations with which those in power flooded the country. So it was that, as Cardinal Manning used to say, "England never gave up the Faith, but was robbed of it." Still, M. Trésal could hardly have been expected to carry his account much further than he has actually done, and in what he has given us, not only is he on sound lines, but he has shown considerable literary skill in compacting so much matter into so small a compass, and yet weaving a narrative which is clear, living, and convincing.

On the question of Anglican Orders, in which his fellow-countrymen have recently taken interest, M. Trésal seems to be rather hazy. On p. 262, he tells of the introduction of the Ordinal of 1552, and says:

The Ordinal of 1550 underwent, in 1552, modifications, of which the most important was the omission, in the ordination of deacons and priests, of the ceremony consisting in the tradition of the chalice and paten, but it [what?] is still in use in the Church of England. It is this which has given rise to the question of Anglican Orders. Are the priests and Bishops ordained by this rite validly ordained? . . . If the imposition of the hands of the consecrating prelate on the candidate and the prayer which accompanies it are the sole essentials for the validity of the two orders, the ordinations conferred by the Ordinal of 1552 would be valid. But Rome has given its formal judgment, and it is not favourable to the Anglican Ordinal.

This seems to mean that Leo XIII. disallowed Anglican Ordinations because the Ordinal of 1552 has no ceremony of tradition of the instruments. Needless to say, he did not do that, but disallowed them expressly on the ground that the prayer accompanying imposition of hands was insufficient and useless.

Again, on p. 382, the author gives quite an imaginary idea of the objections brought against Anglican Orders by English Catholic writers (of whom, by-the-by, Marshall, Harding, and Dorman, living as they did at a time when the character of Parker's ordination was being kept a dead secret by the Government, are not representative specimens). Nor was it suggested by any one that Barlow's consecration was performed in masquerade at the Nag's Head. The difficulty about Barlow was that there was no evidence of his consecration, and a good deal of evidence inconsistent with it. It was Parker whom some suggested was thus consecrated at the Nag's Head.

On the whole, the author gives a good list of his authorities, but we note some striking omissions. In the reign of Henry VIII. there is no mention of Mr. Pocock's *Records*; nor in the reign of Queen Mary of Miss Stone's *Mary Tudor*; nor in the reign of Queen Elizabeth of the Rev. George Phillips's *Ancient Hierarchy*, or of Dom Norbert Birt's *Elizabethan Clergy* which deals with and largely corrects the account given by Mr. Gee, nor does the author appear to have heard of Sander's *De Schismate Anglicano*. Indeed, M. Trésal seems to have had a very poor acquaintance with the works bearing on his subject by English Catholic writers. In the general bibliography no other Catholic books are mentioned save Lingard and Cobbett (the latter not in Abbot Gasquet's edition but in the older edition of 1824). Abbot Gasquet's other works are just mentioned in the bibliographies at the heads of the chapters in the list of *quelques livres*, but the author's use of them is not otherwise much acknowledged. On the question of Anglican Orders not a single English Catholic writer is mentioned, or any writer at all who took the side which the Bull afterwards sanctioned.

4.—THE TWO ASPECTS OF IMMANENCE.¹

Since the Encyclical *Pascendi* appeared, the term Immanence has been much in vogue, but there are comparatively few who can attach to it any distinct conception. The Abbé Thamiry defines it well. "Immanence," he says, "is the (specific) character of every activity which finds in the subject in which it resides its source (*principe*) and its end," and "the type of this activity is living activity, because it springs from the essential spontaneity of a living being, and has for its term the expansion of the constituent energies of this same being. And it is of this nature in the intellectual and moral as well as in the physiological order." Apply this principle to the Physical Universe in the midst of which, and as part of which, man finds himself. We see in it an all-pervading and orderly development, in the gradual formation of its inorganic constituents out of their gaseous antecedents, and still more in the evolution, ontogenic and perhaps phylogenic, of organic life; and again

¹ Les deux aspects de l'Immanence et le Problème religieux. Par Ed. Thamiry, Professeur de la Faculté de Théologie de Lille. Paris: Librairie Bloud. Pp. xxxviii. 308. Price, 4 frs. 50. 1908.

in the intellectual and (?) moral progress of mankind. This means that the Universe has developed through a principle immanent in itself, namely its own inherent principle of growth and expansion, and that the term of its development is within itself, so far forth as it is the attainment of that completeness of form and organization towards which, as the seed tends to completeness in the flower-laden and seed-laden plant, its cosmic development has all along been tending. To that extent then the Universe is dominated by a principle of immanence. But is that all? Has it, at least in its first origin, received those principles of orderly expansion from some source external and transcendent to itself; and during its course, does it receive from without as it were nutriment for its expansive energies to assimilate, as the individual plant does, from soil, and air, and sun; and, in the final outcome, is that completeness of internal expansion its own exclusive end, or does it minister to some further end, lying outside the circumscription of its own being and transcending it, as does the cause from which it first received? Here are two alternative hypotheses of Immanence for which M. Thamiry suggests the names of Absolute and Relative: and which we easily recognize as the rival cosmic theories known as Pantheism and Theism.

About these, or rather about the former, the author truly says:

Philosophers who depart from the Christian tradition invariably end in an identification more or less disguised of God with man or with the world. In vain Kant endeavours to maintain the transcendence of the sovereign master of sanctions, his disciples, with an irresistible logic, bring back the Absolute into the Ego or the Idea, into Humanity or the Superman. The notion of absolute immanence, which they erect into a dogma, does not permit us any longer to conceive of a God who is not the fruit of a course of natural evolution. It is no longer possible to speak of a supernatural order, such as Christianity, which first brought forward that conception, understands it to be. . . . All [who have tried to harmonize the two] have been constrained to confound the two orders, that is, by denying the divine, or, rather, by making it enter into the human, this latter theory being the more fascinating from the point of view of its unity. This disdainful Monism claims to dominate contemporary thought, and even to inspire the religion of the future. M. Auguste Sabatier and M. F. Buisson have developed its dogmatic and ethical principles; such as that "God is immanent in us;" that "I am man, and nothing divine is alien to me," and nothing human either, since the two are ultimately one; that the distinction of one individual from another is merely apparent.

When these rival theories of Absolute and Relative Immanence are brought together, it is inevitable that they should clash at point after point all down the scale of human speculation and human conduct. And hence arise opposing solutions of the problems of cosmic organization, of life and its evolution, of the nature of the soul, of the nature of dogma, of the nature of moral obligation, of the nature of sound apologetic; and at almost every stage we find the Modernism condemned by the recent Encyclical seeking to take up middle positions which only inconsistency of reasoning can prevent lapsing into one or other of the extremes. M. Thamiry's study of the subject is directed to these various problems as consequent on the original divergent conceptions of Immanence. It is a sound and searching examination which may be studied with profit, and it is also useful in enabling English readers to understand what theories are associated with what names, and what progress they have made on the Continent.

Still, it must not be supposed that the mass of those who, now that the subject has become topical, have developed a passing interest in the theory of Immanence, can find a book like this intelligible. In fact, it is impossible for any to master such a subject save those whom nature has endowed with an aptitude for philosophic thinking, and the patient endurance which it invariably demands.

5.—THE TREASURE OF THE SANCTA SANCTORUM.¹

Father Grisar, the well-known Professor of Ecclesiastical history, whose interests of late years have centred mainly in archæological studies, seems to have much reason to complain of the action of M. Philippe Lauer in forestalling his publication of the extraordinarily interesting collection of objects of ecclesiastical art preserved in the treasury of the *Sancta Sanctorum*. Father Grisar's protest, contained in the first chapter of the work before us, is temperate and dignified, but it loses nothing of its force on that account. No doubt there must be others who are to blame—possibly the officials in Rome itself—for

¹ Die Römische Kapelle Sancta Sanctorum und ihr Schatz, von Hartmann Grisar, S.J. Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder. Pp. 156. Price, 10 marks. 1908.

this most unusual procedure, but such an incident makes us wish strongly that there were in existence some sort of international court of honour among scholars which could deal with such offences in a way likely to be effective. In spite of the improved comity among men of letters upon which our age prides itself, such disloyal and ungenerous conduct as that of M. Lauer seems unfortunately to be becoming more and more frequent.

Turning to the book itself, Father Grisar's authoritative description of these treasures of art, which now appears after a by no means unreasonable delay, is so excellent in itself, and so admirably illustrated, as to deprive M. Lauer of any vestige of an excuse for stealing a march upon the officially appointed demonstrator. Undoubtedly, the occasion was a great one. It is given to few men to have the opportunity of inspecting an art collection, hidden from view for more than six hundred years, and that, too, a collection which in its time was deemed the most rare and sacred in the possession of the Apostolic See. With the exception of a brief opening of the treasure cupboard, which was permitted in 1903, to enable Father Jubaru to inspect the reliquary containing the head of St. Agnes, no human eye had rested upon these venerable objects since the days of Pope Nicholas III. Father Jubaru's successful appeal to the late Sovereign Pontiff, Leo XIII., deserves all gratitude, for it undoubtedly paved the way for that more complete examination of the treasure which was undertaken by Father Grisar. In 1903, the bars protecting the treasure cupboard underneath the altar of the *Sancta Sanctorum* had to be filed through, for no key of any sort was in existence, even if the locks after six hundred years of neglect would have responded to its appeal. Now the whole contents of the treasure cupboard have been brought to the Vatican, where the objects of purely archæological and artistic interest have found a home in the Vatican museum, while those of a more sacred character, for example, the jewelled cross (probably of the fifth or sixth century, according to Father Grisar) which contains a relic of the True Cross, is now preserved in the sacristy of the Sistine Chapel. To speak in detail of the various objects comprised in the treasure would be impossible here. The jewelled cross just mentioned and another enamelled cross, of which a really admirable reproduction is given in colour, are objects of the very highest archæological interest. Father

Grisar believes that he can identify this latter almost with certainty as the reliquary found by Pope Sergius in the seventh century, which contained a relic of the True Cross of wondrous size (*mirae magnitudinis*). All which is fully described in the *Liber Pontificalis*. M. Lauer agrees with Father Grisar in this view, as also in the suggestion which the latter made some time before the publication of the present work, that in the enamelled surface of the cross which alone remains, the other side being missing, we possess the back and not the front of the original reliquary. Both these crosses preserve abundant remains of the balm (*balsamum*) with which these and similar objects were constantly smeared as an act of veneration on occasion of processions, &c. Father Grisar devotes a couple of pages¹ to a most interesting account of this strange practice, of which we find frequent mention in the *Liber Pontificalis*. The other contents of the treasure have not been quite so fully described, but yet they include such objects as the head of St. Agnes and the reliquary containing it, the head of St. Praxedes, two ivory pyxes, a number of reliquaries, some remarkable specimens of textiles, and a fragment of the oldest known example of an *Agnus Dei* (this is quite possibly more ancient than the eleventh century), with many other things. All these are fully described with illuminating comments and with a number of very high-class reproductions of photographs. Furthermore, Father Grisar has given a most interesting description of the famous "acheiropoieton" (a picture not painted by human hands) of the *Sancta Sanctorum*, having been allowed by His Holiness's express permission to submit it to a thorough examination. All idea must be given up of regarding it as a work of any particular interest in the history of art. It is undoubtedly ancient, but of most clumsy execution. On the other hand, the silver framework and guard with which almost the whole of the surface of the picture is covered, although of much later date, is a work of quite remarkable beauty. To sum up, the production of the book reflects the highest credit upon the firm of Herder, and Father Grisar may be congratulated on having produced perhaps the most important contribution to the history of early Christian art which has appeared within the last dozen years.

¹ Pp. 91, 92.

6.—THE CAMBRIDGE HISTORY OF ENGLISH LITERATURE.¹

The *Cambridge History of English Literature*, the second volume of which lies before us, is a work which inevitably invites comparison with the *Cambridge Modern History*, equally published by the University Press, and now almost completed. From every point of view, whether of interest, scholarship, or practical utility, we cannot hesitate for a moment in pronouncing that the *Literature* is immeasurably superior to the companion undertaking, and that it bids fair to prove the best work of its kind that has ever been produced, not even excepting the admirable *History of French Literature*, edited by M. Petit de Julleville. One feature in particular in which the English work undoubtedly has the advantage of its French counterpart is the admirable bibliography, a feature which every day becomes more and more appreciated by all true students. The fly-leaf of additions and corrections to Volume I., which is sent out with the copies of Volume II., is something of itself calculated to inspire confidence. It shows that the responsible staff take a real interest in the accuracy of their work, while in so many other undertakings—which it would be invidious to particularize—the reader goes away with the impression that indexes and bibliographies are there because the public expects such things, but that the editors were thoroughly sick of their work long before this stage was reached, and that it is useless to look to them for the revision of a single name or date beyond what they have been paid to furnish.

Writing from a Catholic standpoint, we cannot fail to commend the generally temperate and even sympathetic tone in which the religious questions of the Middle Ages are treated. So far as we have seen, the book, like its predecessor, is one which can be safely placed in the hands of young lady students. Indeed, we cannot but regard the production of such a work as probably not a little due to the presence of ladies in increasing numbers at our great University centres. The fact that this public has to be provided for as well as the men is likely to have a restraining influence upon the editors of text-books and works of reference. Nor do we regard this as likely to prove

¹ Edited by H. W. Ward and A. R. Waller. Vol. II. Pp. xii. 540. Cambridge University Press. 1908. Price, 9s. net.

detrimental to learning, while it certainly promotes tolerance. We might commend the treatment of Wyclif, in the present volume, as something which every sensible Catholic would cordially approve. The writer, the Rev. J. P. Whitney, of King's, sacrifices nothing of his own Anglican principles, but he recognizes that there may be others worthy of respect whose views are not identical with his own. In view of a recent correspondence regarding the *Children's Encyclopædia*, the following remarks may be of interest:

But in [Wyclif's] *De Veritate Sacrae Scripturae*, while there are already complaints that preaching is interfered with, there are no complaints that the Bible in the vernacular is prohibited; indeed the history of the English translations before Wyclif shows that such was not the case. We have already seen in the case of Rolle how translations were made for dwellers in religious houses . . . The translation of the Bible into English was not prohibited, but the use now made of it was leading to a claim for stricter control.

The volume extends from Piers the Plowman to Caxton and Berners, and special attention is given to such comparatively out of the way topics as "English and Scottish Education," "Songs and Ballads," and the "Introduction of the Printing Press." As a specimen of interesting treatment we might indicate the section devoted to Mandeville, though we fancy that the writer has not dwelt sufficiently upon the evidence that some unknown sources in the compilation represent observations which are really of value.

7.—MESSIANIC PHILOSOPHY.¹

The title of Dr. Marsh's contribution to Dr. Aveling's Series may not be as self-explanatory as one could wish, but the sub-title, "An historical and critical examination of the evidence for the existence, death, resurrection, ascension, and divinity of Jesus Christ," makes the purport of his argument clear. Nor is the term *Messianic Philosophy* really inappropriate, for it indicates the aspect under which the subject is examined.

¹ *Messianic Philosophy*. By Gideon W. B. Marsh. [Expository Essays in Christian Philosophy. Edited by the Rev. Francis Aveling, D.D.] Edinburgh: Sands and Co.; St. Louis: Herder. Pp. viii. 180. Price, 3s. 6d. net. 1908.

The philosophy intended is the philosophy of history, which aims at testing recorded events in the light of those principles of human action which are gathered from the experience of life. As rationalistic criticism contests the Christian version of the Gospel history mainly on the ground that it is inconsistent with these principles, it is right that the Christian apologist should meet it on this same ground. And all the more is this necessary because the disposition of educated men, as distinguished from the experts, is to disregard the issues of detailed exegesis and criticism, and to judge the question of Christian origins solely by a rough and ready application of the philosophical tests.

To give the chief points which the author examines in this way. Was Jesus Christ a real historical character or must we infer that He never existed, but was only a legendary hero the conception of whose marvellous personality was elaborated by a slow process out of the general beliefs of the age—as, for instance, out of the worship of the Sun-God, Mithra? Supposing Him to have really lived, did He really die under the torments of crucifixion, or can the fact of His supposed Resurrection be explained on the hypothesis that He merely fell into a swoon from which He afterwards recovered: and are there not improbabilities and inconsistencies in the Gospel narrative of the death which distinctly point to this hypothesis? Or, if He really died cannot the belief in His Resurrection have been prompted not by the disciples having actually seen Him again and talked with Him after His death, but by their having had visions, in keeping with their state of anticipation, which they mistook for appearances in the flesh itself; and are there not in the story of the Resurrection, even more than in the story of the Passion, features which support this vision-theory?

In all these cases it is impossible not to feel that the historical arguments advanced by the rationalistic writers are constructed under the influence of a strong bias, what primarily predisposes them to reject the Church's beliefs being the apparent conflict between these and the usual course of the laws of nature and of human action. They forget, that if it be true that God's "grim silence" was broken by the visible interposition of the God-Man in human affairs, a deflection from the usual course of nature was to be expected, and just such a deflection as the Christian records declare to have taken place; they forget that,

this being so, we are not entitled to reject the story merely on the ground of the unusual elements it contains, but must rather ask whether any other hypothesis can be devised equally able to explain them. If any one will examine the subject from this standpoint, it grows upon him that all the counter-theories to explain the Gospel facts are most inadequate, whilst the Church's doctrine does furnish a sufficient cause. It is on this theme, though by no means neglecting the direct testimonies to the facts, that Dr. Marsh lays the principal stress, and he has worked out his argument with considerable care and skill. For instance, it is thus he argues from the adoption of the Cross as the great Christian symbol :

What could have induced the earliest Christians to adopt as their glory so degrading a symbol as the Latin instrument of a slave's death, unless it had been sanctified to them by Him who died upon it? Here is a definite origin for it and there is no other probable. That it was no adaptation from Mithraism we have already shown, for their form of cross was different, and moreover the Christians held all pagan worship in abhorrence. This very state of mind would have prevented them from choosing as characteristic of them what was already in some sense a badge of heathendom, unless they had been impelled thereto by the history of their Founder's death. Everywhere the sign of the Cross was made as a profession of their faith in the Crucified. In public worship, in private devotion, in the catacombs, in the churches, we find the same testimony. Why should Christians who had before them so many other means of testifying their love of Jesus, so many other emblems that they might have chosen, have selected this particular sign, and thus, as it were, have made their Master a stumbling-block and a ridicule to the pagan world! For, be it remembered, here was no pretty myth of an Apocryphal Sun-God, but the assertion that their Founder was condemned to the death of a slave. Only reality would have induced such a statement and the adoption of such a sign.

This passage also serves to illustrate the author's style, which is that of an earnest and competent layman writing to laymen, not perplexing them with superfluous arrays of erudition, and yet showing an adequate grasp of the subject, and of critical opinions concerning it.

8.—CAMBRIDGE PATRISTIC TEXTS.¹

The object of this excellently edited and beautifully produced series is stated to be "to give to Theological Students the same kind of assistance in reading Patristic works, which is so abundantly given to students of the Classical authors." The volumes under review form the fifth and sixth respectively of the series. They are monuments of exact and exhaustive scholarship. The famous *Confessions* are presented in a guise which is attractive as well as learned, and the editors are indefatigable in tracing parallels to St. Augustine's thought alike in ancient and modern literature. A complete *apparatus criticus* accompanies each page; there is, besides, a separate history of the text, and an introductory Life which, full and judicious in the main, is yet marred by certain non-Catholic views of the nature and function of asceticism.

Much less human interest attaches to the *De Baptismo* of Tertullian, but it is of great doctrinal importance as being the earliest formal treatise on the Sacrament which has survived. It was written when Tertullian was still a Catholic, and its value is very great as manifesting both the theory and practice of the Church of his time. Mr. Lupton has edited the tractate with great care, subjecting the style of the author to a careful analysis and elucidating his meaning in a variety of scholarly notes. The editor, however, travels somewhat beyond his evidence when he says "much of the usual conception of the doctrine of the Atonement . . . come in the first instance from [Tertullian]." The *conception* of the doctrine comes from the Apostles to whom it was revealed: all that this or that Father can do is to trace out the logical implications of the original deposit. Making allowance for the non-Catholic character of some of the commentary, Catholic students will find this series a very useful aid to Patristic studies.

¹ The *Confessions* of St. Augustine, edited by John Gibb, D.D., and William Montgomery, B.D. Cambridge University Press. Pp. lxxiv. 480. Price, 7s. 6d. net. 1908.

Tertullian *de Baptismo*, edited by J. M. Lupton, M.A. Pp. xlv. 78. Price, 4s. 6d. net. 1908.

9.—THE SYSTEM OF PRIVATE PROPERTY.¹

There is much writing for and against Socialism, and the tendency is to judge it chiefly by the effects it is calculated to have if substituted for the present system of private property. That is a suitable mode of viewing the subject, and when followed with insight and impartiality is not favourable to Socialism. But a great deal of misunderstanding disturbs the controversy, most often to the disadvantage of the opponents of Socialism, through the want of an exact conception of the fundamental principles on which the rights and duties of property rest. Indeed, we may say justly that the present crisis into which we have fallen is mainly due to the logical working-out of the false theories of the seventeenth and eighteenth century theorists, who derived the right of property from hypothetic social contracts, or from the prescriptions of a supposed positive law when civilization first began to supervene on barbarism. These theories, when worked out under the natural bias of their advocates or the spirit of their time, have invariably led to exaggerations either on behalf of or to the prejudice of the owners of property; and thereby, when economic difficulties have pressed severely, have excited heated controversies and revolutionary movements, to settle which was hopeless save by the power of the stronger. Meanwhile, the Catholic theologians, under the Church's inspiration and supervision, have steadily pursued, as in so many other departments, a middle course. Their Catholic doctrine may be found in outline in the works of a writer so ancient as St. Thomas of Aquin, but it was hardly known to the modern world, at all events till Leo XIII. expounded it in his famous Encyclical on the Condition of the Labourers. If, however, any one wishes to see it stated in a more developed, and yet simple and easily intelligible form, he may profitably have recourse to M. Garriguet's *Régime de la Propriété*.

According to this doctrine a man's right to hold private property is a natural right, which therefore the State, when it comes into being, must respect. It is a natural right, because, apart from it, as experience proves, man can neither work out his natural destiny in human society without being inevitably

¹ *Traité de Sociologie d'après les principes de la Théologie Catholique. Régime de la Propriété. Par L. Garriguet. Paris: Bloud et Cie. Pp. xx. 335. Price, 3 fr. 50. 1907.*

involved in perpetual quarrels; nor take upon himself the obligations of the head of a family; nor make prudent provision for the future. Moreover, this natural right involves that he should be able to possess land as well as things movable, because it is only thus that he can be induced to put it to the best use, by bestowing upon it labour and expense, the fruits from which are not to be expected till after long years of patient waiting and preparation. On the other hand, this does not mean that every one must be the freeholder of a plot of land, since experience shows that it is quite possible for a vast number of people to make their livings by industrial and other occupations, and very good livings too, without possessing an inch of land except as rent-payers or leaseholders. But it means that those who seek their living direct from the ownership of the land must be allowed to own it in such wise that they can get out of it, not merely precarious, but stable and increasing harvests. The general right of ownership is indeed common to all men, but it needs to be determined for the individuals by some juridical fact entitling this particular person to become the possessor of this particular property, movable or immovable. And what is that? The author proves that it is neither the mere fact that a man has put his labour into it, nor that having first occupied it he has confirmed his occupation by adding to it his labour, but the simple fact of first occupation—or, of course, the fact of purchase or gift from a previous lawful possessor. It is not necessary that a man should put labour into what he has thus occupied, if he can make use of it apart from labour; it is enough that he takes to himself what previously belonged to no one. Still there is another side to the question, and the Catholic doctrine, whilst laying down that the State must respect rights of property, fully allows to it a manifold right to limit and regulate in the general interests the use which the owners may make of their property. The right to live is prior to the right to hold property, and the State is justified in seeing that this prior right is maintained. If an owner of vast territories leaves them uncultivated, with the result that multitudes around him are unable to make a living, the State is justified in requiring him to put an end to the injustice, or if he will not, in putting an end to it itself; and M. Garriguet brings forward one or two interesting instances in which the Popes, in their days of temporal power, acted on that principle. The State, too, is

entitled to take measures for limiting the amount of property that can fall into single hands, or for encouraging the multiplication of ownerships, and so on. It has these powers, as the authoritative representative of that common welfare to which the right of private property is subordinated.

Another very important point which the author brings out regards the claims of charity as supervening on the claims of justice. Charity is a word that through its frequent misuse has fallen into ill-repute, but it is a word of the utmost importance. Justice binds a man to render to others what is theirs; charity binds him to aid them out of what is his; and it is the Church's principle that a man is *bound* in charity to bestow his superfluities on his neighbours. The word superfluity is not indeed to be too strictly interpreted, and what is superfluity for one is not such for another, nor has the State the right to compel and control the dispensation of a man's private charities. But he is bound to dispense them himself in works of public or private beneficence, or almsdeeds, as seems desirable; and what is most wanted in the present day—which, however, will never be obtained save in so far as the Church is left free to diffuse her true spirit through the world—is that this noble conception of charity should be reinstated in its proper place, that it may put an end to the rampant egotism of enormously rich people, who give themselves up wholly to the pursuit of extravagant pleasures, whilst so many poor are suffering around them.

These are some of the ideas to which M. Garriguet directs attention, and which make his book well worthy of perusal.

10.—MORAL THEOLOGY IN ENGLISH.¹

The day is unhappily past, when those lay-folk who might be trusted to make good and judicious use of text-books of Moral Theology, might also be presumed to be able to understand the ecclesiastical Latin in which they were written. And so it is perhaps inevitable that the example of foreign countries, who have published such books in the vernacular, should be

¹ *A Manual of Moral Theology for English-speaking countries.* By Thomas Slater, S.J. Vol. I. New York: Benziger. Pp. 668. Price, 11s. 1908.

followed here and in the States. A certain risk in such matters has to be faced. Principles have often to be stated concisely: their application must be conditioned by a number of circumstances, which want of space prevents being set forth at length; definitions, however carefully worded, can be misunderstood. Consequently, in ignorant, untrained, or malicious hands, books like these, dealing for the most part with moral diseases, may do much harm. The author, in his Preface, states with sufficient clearness the nature of his work, and does what he can to guard against its abuse.

The clergy, and theological students generally, will find the volume chiefly useful on account of the constant reference to English and American law it contains. The American legal aspects have been dealt with in Notes incorporated in the text, by Father Michael Martin, S.J., of St. Louis. The arrangement followed is that common in treatises on Moral. Four sections on Human Acts, Conscience, Law, Sin, give the general principles, and then follow applications to the various commandments and the duties of special states of life. Special attention is paid to the important subject of Contracts. The language is simple, but sufficient care has not always been taken to avoid unnecessarily technical or Latinized phrases. Thus *morose pleasure* is hardly an adequate translation of *delectatio morosa*.

Father Slater has held the Chair of Moral Philosophy at St. Beuno's College for the past sixteen years, and during that time has acquired a reputation for soundness and sobriety of judgment, which is thoroughly well borne out by this book. We share his hope that the volume will also be useful to non-Catholics, who have seldom trustworthy first-hand acquaintance with Catholic doctrine. A second volume will complete the treatise.

Short Notices.

A VERY cordial welcome is due to the appearance of Volumes VII. and VIII. of the English edition of Professor Pastor's great **History of the Popes** (Kegan Paul, 12s. net. per vol.), which correspond to the first part of the fourth German volume. Father Ralph Kerr of the Oratory has taken up the task of editing, so ably conducted in regard to the previous volumes by the late Father F. J. Antrobus, and the translation is due to that indefatigable worker in the cause of Catholic literature, Lady Amabel Kerr, whose loss we have had so recently to deplore. As we reviewed the original in the January of last year, we need only mention here that these volumes embrace the Pontificate of Leo X., one very familiar to English readers from the biography of Roscoe. Although no grave reproach rests on the moral character of Leo X., yet Catholic readers have need to remind themselves, in view of the worldliness of much of his conduct, of the pregnant words of his great predecessor, Leo I., *Petri dignitas etiam in indigno herede non deficit*. Distinction should be made, here as elsewhere, between the man and the office. As during the dozen years which elapsed between his third and fourth volumes, Professor Pastor brought out "greatly elaborated and improved" editions of the first three, containing corrections, answers to his critics and new matter of various sorts, it may be worth the publisher's consideration whether the first six volumes of the English edition should not be revised and brought up to date.

Anti-Modernist literature grows apace in the Church, as heresy fulfils its providential function of calling forth clearer and more formal expression of the truth. Of three booklets before us, dealing with the subject, one is produced in Austria, one in France, and the third in America. The occasion of the German treatise is indicated in its title—**Die Enzyklika Pius X. gegen den Modernismus und Ehrhard's Kritik derselben** (Rauch : Innsbruck, 0.50 m.). Professor Ehrhard was amongst the very few German Catholics who wrote in an unbecoming spirit about the Encyclical *Pascendi*, and he published his criticisms in a non-Catholic journal, the *Internationale Wochenschrift*. Father Joseph Müller, S.J., in his answer, takes occasion to describe the differences, great or trifling, between the new theories and the traditional Catholic theology. To judge of Professor Ehrhard's criticisms which, we are glad to say, he has since withdrawn, from the reply, they do not seem to be based so much upon a nebulous mysticism or a mistaken philosophy, as on an excessive respect for the immense array of learning which the opponents of Catholicism in Germany appear to have on their side. Father Müller handles the subject with much precision and knowledge.

Professor J. Godrycz's tract, *The Doctrine of Modernism and its Refutation* (McVey, 75 cents), claims to be the first book of its kind in America. It is a clear and methodical exposition of the chief features of the Modernist theory, treated from the standpoint of reason and science alone, and effectively demolished in six separate chapters.

Although the *Catechism on Modernism* (Washbourne: 6d. net.), is in English, it is from a French source, being the work of the Rev. Père J. B. Lemius, O.M.I., whose fellow-Oblate, Father John Fitzpatrick, has translated it. The words "Authorized Translation" on the title-page would seem to imply that an American translation of the same work, called "*A Catechism of Modernism*," lacks some essential sanction. The plan of the work is to make the text itself of the Encyclical, which is reproduced in its entirety and in the exact order of its ideas, respond to a series of questions addressed to the author, and so framed as to emphasize the meaning and the logical connection of parts. It is an advantage to have the close reasoning of the Encyclical thus partially digested, but it appears to us that much the same effect could have been produced and much space spared by the plentiful use of sub-headings and "cut-in" notes. We should suggest to the Rev. translator that *personatos male homines* rather means *men masked for an evil purpose* than *men who are badly disguised*: the whole previous contention being that their disguise was extremely efficient.

Canon William Barry's *The Tradition of Scripture* (Longmans, 3s. 6d. net) is the second of *The Westminster Library* to reach a second edition. The learned author has taken the occasion not only to bring the volume up-to-date, but to repeat and emphasize his attitude towards the various points of Biblical criticism he has necessarily to deal with, declaring that, "outside the directions of the Holy See it has been neither his wish nor his purpose to travel." The rules that should guide the orthodox critic are drawn out with admirable clearness in the Introduction, and serve as canons of interpretation in regard to the theories discussed. We are glad to renew the welcome with which we greeted the first edition of this valuable book.

The World in which we live (Herder, 6s. 3d.), by Father Rudolph Meyer, S.J., runs a risk, on account of its ambiguous title, of being classified as a work on Cosmography, just as a well-known book of sermons, —*Salvage from the Wreck*—was actually entered under Maritime Law. In reality, Father Meyer's book is a spiritual treatise of great value designed to show the world as it appears to the eyes of faith, and to expose the various errors, intellectual and moral, that are prevalent in it. The volume forms a sequel to *First Lessons in the Science of the Saints*, which we reviewed five years ago, and we are promised another to complete the course. The author's style is as clear and pleasing as his doctrine is sound, and his pages are enlivened by abundance of quotations from all manner of sources: detailed references, however, would have made them more useful. As to the price, if the order of the figures were reversed, it would represent more closely the English scale.

Father Thaddeus, O.F.M., has presented us with a very beautiful book in his new version of *The Imitation of Christ* (Burns and Oates, 6s. net). It is handsomely printed in bold clear type with wide ruled margins and rubrics, which make it a delight to the eye. Regarding the translation, Father Thaddeus has proceeded on a new plan, which was first suggested, as he courteously states, by a reviewer in *THE MONTH* (March, 1880). This

is to recur, in all cases of ambiguity in the Latin, to an early Flemish version made by Heribert Rosweyde, S.J. Flemish was à Kempis' mother tongue, and the influence of its idioms appears constantly in the Latin of the *Imitation*, thus affording a key to many puzzles. We may therefore be assured that this new translation is much nearer to the meaning of the original than any previous one. Father Thaddeus gives us a means of judging by citing a number of passages where the current English is vague or clumsy because the sense has not been fully grasped. It would be unreasonable to expect that the changes will be everywhere welcomed; mere conservatism will lead people to prefer their old *Mumpsimus*, and in some cases, we are not sure that the altered phrases, from the point of view of English, are improvements. *Be not embarrassed by the consideration of the writer's qualifications* (I. v. 1) is certainly more correct than *Let not the authority of the writer offend thee*, but it is as surely a more awkward mouthful. We should have been glad if the editor had reproduced in this "Seraphic Edition," so excellent in all other respects, the recognized rhythmic effect of the original Latin structure, pointed out by Dr. Hirsche and effectively rendered in the late Mr. Kegan Paul's version.

A second edition, translated with additions from the fourth German edition, of **The History of the Passion** (Herder, 5s. 3d.), by Father James Groenings, S.J., has lately been issued. We have here an apt and copious selection of the historical, social, and antiquarian lore with which generations of commentators have supplemented the concise narrative of the Evangelists, so that a background of much interesting detail is provided for the setting of the Great Tragedy. At the same time, the lessons which every line of the story tells are judiciously enlarged upon, so that the book is admirably adapted for spiritual reading and meditation as well for study.

Those who like variety in their devotions—and we all do occasionally, if only to appreciate our favourite ones the more—will be glad to have their attention called to **Ancient Devotions for Holy Communion** (Kegan Paul, 2s. 6d. net.), which the piety of S. A. C. has compiled from Eastern and Western liturgies. The booklet, which contains an Introduction by Abbot Gasquet, is now in its second edition.

The first four volumes of the St. Nicholas Series of Beautiful Books (Macdonald and Evans, 2s. per vol.), which we noticed last month, have been quickly followed by two others—**St. Christopher and Other Stories**, by the Rev. Cyril Martindale, S.J., and **Jeanne d'Arc**, by Miss C. M. Antony. Readers of **THE MONTH** need no introduction to the glow of imagination and delicate harmonies that mark "Jan de Geollac's" literary work. In these tales, he has woven and pieced out the slender threads of history with great skill and insight, and child and adult alike will appreciate the fine result.

The issue of *Jeanne d'Arc* at present is especially appropriate when a French free-thinker is endeavouring to darken her fame and pervert her memory. Miss Antony tells the thrilling story well, and Father Benson contributes an illuminating Preface, one sentence of which is well worth quoting—"There seems really nothing to console us [Catholics] for Cauchon [the Bishop of Beauvais] . . . except the reflection that a man called Judas Iscariot was among the Apostles." The coloured illustrations of both volumes maintain a high standard, though they do not reach the perfection of those in *Barnaby Rudge*.

We noticed in March last a very useful little American book—*The*

Sunday School Teacher's Guide to Success. Now there comes from the same energetic quarter, *The Catholic Sunday School: Some suggestions on its aim, work, and management* (Herder, 4s. 6d.), by the Rev. Bernard Feeney, a larger and more elaborate treatise on the same subject. If the Church claims a right to a share in educating the young, it is because she has charge of the eternal welfare of their souls and accordingly she must reckon religious teaching as of more importance than any other. In many places to-day she is shut out of the elementary schools and must do her work on the one day still recognized as hers. Hence the importance of such books as Father Feeney's, which discuss from a practical standpoint the objects of Sunday School and the best means, under varying circumstances, of fulfilling them. The book is enriched by an Introduction from the eloquent pen of Archbishop Ireland and by the Encyclical of Pope Pius X., on the Teaching of Christian Doctrine, printed as an Appendix.

The "J. J. Elar," whose book, entitled *The Apocalypse, The Antichrist, and The End*, we reviewed last December, has revealed himself, in another volume on the same subject, to be Lieut.-Col. James J. L. Ratton, late of the Indian Army Medical Service. His new work, *Essays on the Apocalypse* (Burns and Oates, 3s. 6d.), is described as an extension of the former, and is mainly devoted to establishing 67 A.D., the close of Nero's persecution, as the date of composition, in preference to 96 A.D., hitherto the commonly accepted date. The author rightly contends that in a book claiming to be prophetic, it is a matter of the first importance to fix the date on which it was written. He accumulates arguments internal and external to show that the acceptance of 67 A.D. gives the key to many obscurities and removes many inconveniences, such as St. John's prophesying the destruction of Jerusalem after the event. Although, in our opinion, successful in its main contention, the author's reasoning is not always clearly arranged; it is strange, moreover, that amidst such a display of learning, *stadii* appears throughout as the plural of *stadium*.

Pending the issue of the rationally-edited New Testament for which a plea was advanced in our last number, books like the Abbé Verdunoy's *L'Évangile: Synopse, Vie de Notre-Seigneur, Commentaire* (Gabalda, 3 fr. 50) are to be welcomed as promoting a deeper interest in our Lord's Life and a truer understanding of it. The volume may be described as a Harmony, with commentary interspersed between the several episodes. But no attempt has been made to weave the four Gospels into one narrative: they are left in parallel columns as in Father Coleridge's *Vita Vitae Nostrae*. A full synopsis is provided, also a useful Introduction on the Gospels as a whole and severally.

Louis XI. of France, whose reign coincided exactly with that of the first Yorkist king, Edward IV., is known to history as the strong and crafty ruler who broke the feudal power of the French nobles and created the absolute monarchy. M. Marcel Navarre, in his historical study—*Louis XI. en pèlerinage* (Bloud, 3fr.), puts before us another aspect of the king's character. The energy he put into his wars and his diplomacy is seen also in his devotion. He had an especial passion for pilgrimages, and our author, with much interesting archaeological detail, traces his journeyings, both as Dauphin and King, to thirty-six of the national shrines.

M. l'Abbé Hamon's scholarly Life of Blessed Margaret Mary, which is in effect and intent the first part of a history of the Devotion to the Sacred Heart, was warmly commended in *THE MONTH* for June, 1907,

as a distinct advance on previous biographies, a work in which historical science, literary skill and genuine devotion were happily blended. We are glad then that a large edition having been rapidly sold out, the author has sanctioned a "popular" issue in another format. This *Vie de la Bienheureuse Marguerite-Marie* (Beauchesne : 4 francs) reproduces the previous edition textually, with the exception of the critical apparatus and scientific notes. For these the student must still refer to the original volume.

The Rev. J. A. Dewe, A. M., in his *History of Economics* (Benziger, 6s.) reckons three great influences as modifying the course of human history, Physical Surroundings, Religion, and Economics. Putting aside the first two, he endeavours to give a comprehensive view of the effect that the last-named cause has had in human affairs. He defines Economics as the science of how men make and distribute wealth. Naturally, considering the vastness and obscurity of the subject, the sketch is not exhaustive, but the Rev. author gives a very clear and orderly outline of his theme, dividing history into the Greek and Roman, the Medieval, and the Modern periods. His modern period ends with the French Revolution, but in a final chapter he gives a summary account of how economics are becoming more and more the preponderating factor in all great movements of mankind. As a matter of practical economics, we may remind the publishers that six shillings in England, as regards book-prices, is a good deal more than \$1.50 in America.

The French genius delights in analysis and classification. M. Xavier Moisan, whose work on the metaphysical proofs of God's existence, noticed in our January issue, shows him to be a capable philosopher, attempts in *Psychologie de l'Incroyant* (Beauchesne, 3 fr. 50), a dissection of the unbelief of modern times. His own countrymen naturally furnish him with the materials readiest to hand. He considers three classes—*Le Railleur*, *Le Positiviste*, and *L'Intellectuel*—typified by Voltaire, Comte, and the late Charles Renouvier respectively, and, by constant reference to their writings gives as clear a picture as possible of their mental and spiritual state.

It is a common practice of some advocates of Socialism amongst ourselves to represent their systems as essentially an economic doctrine, and therefore as neutral in regard to all creeds. They would succeed better in recommending this view if they could persuade us that there is such a thing in practice as a negative attitude towards religion, and if they could manage to destroy the works of Marx and Engels, to whom is due whatever intellectual coherence their ideals possess. Father John Ming, S.J., in *The Characteristics and the Religion of Modern Socialism* (Benziger, 6s) discusses two points—What is modern Socialism, as distinct from previous phases of the movement, and what is its attitude towards religion. He relies throughout on the declarations of responsible leaders, which he examines in great detail, and shows that Socialism in its modern aspect is essentially opposed to Christianity, and that its religion is humanitarianism. This, and the author's previous book, *The Data of Modern Ethics examined*, are valuable contributions to the Christian side of the controversy.

Somewhat similar in effect, though dealing with a smaller but more highly-organized body, is M. Léon Dehon's *Le Plan de la Franc-Maçonnerie en Italie et en France* (Lethielleux, 1 fr.), which professes to provide the key to the history of the last forty years in those countries. In a small compass the author has brought together a vast amount of testimony to the activity of the Lodges in the anti-clerical campaign. He shows that if the French

Masons and their tools have been more energetic and have advanced further than the Italians, these latter had hit upon the special "Briand" plan of *associations culturelles* forty years before. The Syllabus of Pius IX., in 1864, with its declaration of the rights of clerics to hold and administer ecclesiastical property, nipped that project in the bud, and our own Pius, by his successive condemnations of M. Briand's insidious proposals, has hitherto baffled the modern efforts to laicize and nationalize the Church. The author traces, step by step, the realization of the programme of the Lodges, citing everywhere first-hand authorities for his statements. It is a strange and startling disclosure, and should do much to further the growth of the Anti-Masonic league which has been formed in France, and which has begun by publishing the names of the 30,000 Masons to be found in France and her colonies.

Christ among Men, or the characteristics of Jesus as seen in the Gospel (Washbourne, 2s.) is a devotional work, the plan of which is fairly indicated in the title. It is an excellent translation by L. M. Ward from the French of Abbé Sertillanges, who joins to his knowledge of Scripture, a personal acquaintance with the features and customs of the Holy Land and a sympathetic style.

† In **The Marks of the Bear Claws** (Benziger, 3s.) Father Henry Spalding, S.J., has constructed an exciting story around the person and exploits of the famous Father Marquette, the discoverer of the Mississippi. A certain want of naturalness results from the "bookish" language of the various speakers. The same fault, to a lesser degree, as all the characters are educated folk, occurs in **Thora: A Girl Artist** (Washbourne, 1s. net, paper), by Ymal Oswin, a writer not unknown to THE MONTH. The story is prettily told, however, with art and love and religion in due and harmonious proportion.

Evêques de France (Lethielleux, 1 fr. 25), by the Abbé P. Poey, is a sort of *Who's Who* of the French Episcopate, including the Colonial Bishops. A page-long biography is given in each case, fronted by a portrait of the subject. The whole gives an interesting and vivid impression of a body of men whose dignity and forbearance under great trials has called forth the admiration of the Catholic world.

A keen eye for all the beauties of nature and an apt and cultured choice of phrases to express them are qualities conspicuous in Lady Gilbert's latest book of verse, **Spirit and Dust** (Elkin Matthews, 2s. 6d. net). The poems are almost all descriptive, with no nearer approach to human interest than the assigning of man's thoughts and passions to the inanimate creation. The quatrains on Autumn form a typical and very beautiful instance. But everywhere throughout the book there is colour and melody, fair thoughts fairly clad.

MM. J. Gabalda et Cie. have issued a new French translation of **Callista** (3 fr. 50), by Mme. M. A. Pératé, desiring to spread as widely as possible in France as a specimen of that "living apologetic" so characteristic of the author.

Whilst non-Catholic theologians, without any stable or consistent philosophical theory to guide and clarify their speculations, are losing hold more and more on the great central doctrine of Christianity, the Incarnation of God the Son, it behoves the children of the Church to rally with greater energy to its defence. This is best done by stating with all possible exactness what is of faith in the matter, and by showing that reason, if it is

surpassed, is not contradicted by revelation. Eminently *à propos*, therefore, is a luminous French exposition—*L'Incarnation d'après St. Thomas d'Aquin* (Gabalda, 4 fr.)—which Père A. Villard, O.P., has just published. The first part is positive, explaining the doctrine and its historical development; the second, scholastic, defining the terms, nature, substance, person, &c., and showing their place in the mystery. A third section is devoted to stating the appropriateness of this wonderful condescension of Almighty God. In contrast to the nebulous, variable, subjective theories of the Modernists is this clear teaching which recognizes the place and limits of reason and its relations to divine faith.

Closely connected with the Incarnation, as effect with cause, is the great question of Grace, which is treated by Padre R. Tabarelli, Professor of Theology at the Roman College in *De Gratia Christi* (Bretschneider, 7.50 fr.) Here again the *Summa* forms the basis of the doctrine, which is set forth in great and exact detail according to the practice of the schools, with abundant references both to ancient and modern literature. In the burning question about the efficacy of grace, the author, after an admirably clear exposition of the various systems, adheres to that which best secures the freedom of the human will.

Messrs. Burns and Oates have issued two famous songs of Mr. A. P. Graves, *Father O'Flynn* and *Ould Doctor Mack*, with ten illustrations by L. D. Symington, and a Latin and a Gaelic version of the former. "Father O'Flynn" is now firmly rooted in popular favour, largely owing to the vogue originally given it by Sir Charles Santley, and its rollicking air. "Doctor Mack," devoid of both advantages, is comparatively unknown, though in our opinion it is the better composition. We have never been able to see why the Bishop should have been irresistibly tickled by the remark—*Is it lave gaiety all to the laity?* Father Alphonsus, who contributes the Latin version, is not a Father Prout, but he has some happy phrases. Of the merits of the Gaelic we cannot judge. Mr. Symington does not give us by any means the typical *soggarth*, though his bold-line drawings are pleasing.

Very appropriate to the present season comes *Pentecost Preaching* (Baker, 4s. 6d. net), by the Rev. Arthur Devine, Passionist. It consists of twenty-five sermons for Pentecost and the Sundays after, each preceded by a full and logical synopsis, so that those preachers who prefer to clothe the ideas in their own language may do so. The sermons will be found to contain dogmatic and moral instruction suitably blended, and should prove very useful to our hard-worked clergy.

The publication in English of the Library of St. Francis of Sales, a complete edition of the Saint's works and of others concerning him, has not, we are glad to say, been interrupted by the death of the original zealous and accomplished editor, Canon Mackey, O.S.B. The volume before us, the sixth, contains *The Cantic of Canticles* and *The depositions of St. Jane F. de Chantal* (Burns and Oates, 6s.). The first-named treatise is the Saint's own, being a running mystical commentary on the poem considered as an allegory of God and the Soul. The second contains the evidence given by St. Jane Frances in the Process of the Saint's Beatification. It is invaluable for a right understanding of St. Francis' character, as it gives the impression he made upon another Saint who lived in the closest spiritual relation with him and could best appreciate his sanctity.

The long-felt need of some treatise in English on Vocation to the Clerical State in distinction to Vocation to Religion, has been supplied by

Priestly Vocation and Tonsure (Cathedral Library Association, New York), anonymously translated from the French of Père Bacuez. It deals, by a series of instructions and meditations, with the qualifications for admission into the ecclesiastical state and with its obligations. The translator has had English-speaking countries in view, and has modified the original accordingly where necessary.

It has rarely, if ever, been our good fortune to read such an interesting commentary on any of the many features of Holy Writ as that which Mr. Maunder offers in his second edition of **The Astronomy of the Bible** (London: Clark and Co, 5s. net.). The work must appeal strongly not only to all who wish to understand the Scriptures, but to the many who now-a-days take an interest in the state of astronomical science among the Hebrews and coeval nations. Those people, too, who are inclined to be afraid of what is termed Comparative Religion, will be much helped by the author's discussion of the relative age of the Babylonian myth of Creation and the account in Genesis. In a brief notice like this, we can only call attention to the general excellence of the volume, and, particularly, of the material gathered together in Book III., where, under the title of "Times and Seasons," the author discusses the state of astronomical knowledge of those by-gone ages as deduced from their divisions of time, their Sabbaths, Jubilee years, and festival dates. Even more interesting is his examination of three astronomical marvels recorded, two in the Old and one in the New Testament, the long day of Joshua, the dial of Achaz, and the Star of Bethlehem. Here, Mr. Maunder offers suggestions which, while leaving these events their supernatural character, aim at removing astronomical difficulties. Of these we only venture to say that they are very ingenious and plausible. The book is well set up: the illustrations well chosen, and the map and the few diagrams needed are perfectly clear.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

(Reviewed in present issue or reserved for future notice.)

From the Author :

THE ASTRONOMY OF THE BIBLE: By E. W. Maunder, F.R.A.S.
Second Edition. Pp. viii, 410. Price, 5s. net. 1908.

Baker, London :

PENTECOST PREACHING: By the Rev. Arthur Devine, Passionist.
Pp. 306. Price, 4s. 6d. net. 1908.

Beauchesne et Cie., Paris :

PSYCHOLOGIE DE L'INCROYANT: By Xavier Moisan. Pp. 340.
Price, 3 fr. 50. 1908. VIE DE LA BIENHEUREUSE MARGUERITE-
MARIE: By Auguste Hamon. Second Edition. Pp. 520. Price, 4 fr.
1908.

Benziger, New York :

A MANUAL OF MORAL THEOLOGY: By Rev. Thomas Slater, S.J.
Vol. I. Pp. 668. Price, 16s. 1908. THE MARKS OF THE BEAR
CLAWS: By H. Spalding, S.J. Pp. 230. Price, 3s. 1908.

Bretschneider, Rome :

DE GRATIA CHRISTI: By P. Richard Tabarelli. Pp. xii, 534. Price,
7.50 fr. 1908.

Burns and Oates, Ltd., London :

FATHER O'FLYNN, &C.: By A. P. Graves. Illustrated by L. D. Syming-
ton. Pp. 32. Price, 1s. net. 1908. ESSAYS ON THE APOCALYPSE:
By J. J. L. Ratton. Pp. viii, 174. Price, 3s. 6d. 1908. THE
IMITATION OF CHRIST: Edited by Father Thaddeus, O.F.M. Price,
6s. net. 1908. THE MYSTICAL EXPLANATION OF THE CANTICLE
OF CANTICLES: THE DEPOSITIONS OF ST. JANE FRANCES DE
CHANTAL: (Library of St. Francis de Sales. Vol. vi.) Pp. 254.
Price, 6s. 1908.

Cambridge University Press :

NESTORIUS AND HIS TEACHING: By J. F. Bethune-Baker. Pp. xvi,
232. Price, 4s. 6d. net. 1908. TERTULLIAN DE BAPTISMO:
Edited by J. M. Lupton, M.A. Pp. xlv, 78. Price, 4s. 6d. net.
1908.

Cathedral Library Association, New York :

PRIESTLY VOCATION AND TONSURE: From the French of Père Bacuez.
Pp. xiv, 314. 1908.

Catholic World Press, New York :

LORD BACON v. SCHOLASTIC PHILOSOPHY: By Rev. Michael Hogan,
S.J. Pp. 40. 1908.

Desclée et Cie., Tournai:

LE NOMBRE MUSICAL GREGORIEN OU RHYTHMIC GREGORIENNE :
Théorie et Pratique. Par le R. P. Dom André Mocquereau, Prieur
 de Solesmes. Tome i. Pp. 430. Price, 6 fr.

Elkin Mathews, London:

SPIRIT AND DUST: By Rosa Mulholland. Pp. 94. Price, 2s. 6d. net.
 1908.

Gabalda et Cie., Paris:

CALLISTA, ESQUISSE DU TROISIEME SIECLE: Translated by Marie
 Agnes Pératé. Pp. 377. Price, 3 fr. 50. 1908.

Gili, Barcelona:

SAN JUAN: ESTUDIO CRITICO-EXEGETICO SOBRE EL CUARTO
 EVANGELIO: By P. L. Murillo, S.J. Pp. 568. Price, 10 pesetas. 1908.
 LAS COFRADIAS Y CONGREGACIONES ECLESIASTICAS SEGUN LA
 DISCIPLINA VIGENTE: By P. Juan Ferreres, S.J. 2nd Edition. Pp. 212.
 Price, 2 pesetas. 1903. LOS ESPOUSALES Y EL MATRIMONIO
 SEGUN LA NOVISIMA DISCIPLINA: By P. Juan Ferreres, S.J. 2nd
 Edition. Pp. 240. Price, 2 pesetas. 1908. LA IGLESIA Y EL
 OBRERO: by P. Ernesto Guitart, S.J. Pp. 296. Price, 2.50 pesetas.
 1908. LA CRUZADA DE LA BUENA PRENSA: By D. A. López
 Peláez, Bishop of Jaca. Pp. 356. Price, 3.50 pesetas. 1908.
 PENSAMIENTOS ESCOGIDOS DE S. TERESA: By P. J. Pons, S.J.
 Pp. 96. Price, 0.50 pesetas. 1908.

Herder, Fribourg and St. Louis:

THE CATHOLIC SUNDAY SCHOOL: By the Rev. Bernard Feeney, with
 an Introduction by Archbishop Ireland. Pp. xxii, 234. Price, 4s. 6d.
 1908. THE WORLD IN WHICH WE LIVE: By R. J. Meyer, S.J.
 Pp. 408. Price, 6s. 3d. 1908. THE HISTORY OF THE PASSION:
 By James Groenings, S.J. Second Edition. Pp. xiv, 462. Price,
 5s. 3d. 1908. THEOLOGIA BIBLICA: By Michael Hetzenauer, O.C.
 Tom. i., Vetus Testamentum. Pp. xxxii, 654. Price, 15 fr. 1908.
 DER TABERNAKEL EINST UND JETZT von Felix Raible. Pp. xxii,
 336. Price, 6.60 marks. 1908. EUCHARISTIE UND BUSSSAKRAMENT
 IN DEN ERSTEN SECHS JAHRHUNDERTEN DER KIRCHE: By
 Gerhard Rauschen. Pp. viii, 204. Price, 4 marks. 1908. A
 STUDY IN AMERICAN FREEMASONRY: Edited by Arthur Preuss.
 Pp. xiv, 434. Price, \$1.50. 1908.

Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner, and Co., London:

ANCIENT DEVOTIONS FOR HOLY COMMUNION: Compiled by S. A. C.
 Second Edition. Pp. xiv, 203. Price, 2s. 6d. net. 1908.

Lethielleux, Paris:

DERNIER MELANGES: par Louis Veuillot. Edited by François
 Veuillot. Vol. I. Année 1873. Second édition. Pp. xii, 630. Price,
 6.00 fr. 1908. LE PLAN DE LA FRANC-MAÇONNERIE EN ITALIE
 ET EN FRANCE: By Léon Dehon. Second Edition. Pp. 104.
 Price, 1.00 fr. 1908. EVEQUES DE FRANCE: By the Abbé
 P. Poey. Second Edition. Pp. iv, 188. Price, 1.25 fr. 1908.
 MANUEL DE PHILOSOPHIE: By Gaston Sortais. Pp. xxxii, 984.
 Price, 9 fr. 1908.

Longmans, Green, and Co., London:

THE TRADITION OF SCRIPTURE: By Canon W. Barry. Second revised Edition. Pp. 278. Price, 3s. 6d. net. 1908. BUDDHISM: PRIMITIVE AND PRESENT: By R. S. Copleston, D.D. Second Edition. Pp. xiv, 300. Price, 10s. 6d. net. 1908.

Macdonald and Evans, London:

JEANNE D'ARC: By C. M. Antony. With six illustrations in colour. Pp. xvi, 186. Price, 2s. net. 1908. ST. CHRISTOPHER AND OTHER STORIES: By Rev. Cyril Martindale, S.J. With six illustrations in colour. Pp. 158. Price, 2s. net. 1908.

M. Vey, Philadelphia:

THE DOCTRINE OF MODERNISM AND ITS REFUTATION: By J. Godrycz, D.D., Ph. D. Pp. 123. Price, 75 cents. 1908.

Sir Isaac Pitman, London:

LIBERAL THEOLOGY AND THE GROUND OF FAITH: By Hakluyt Egerton. Pp. 248. Price, 3s. 6d. net. 1908. THE CHURCH IN MODERN ENGLAND: By F. Claude Kempson, M.B. Pp. 216. Price, 2s. 6d. net. 1908.

Sands and Co., London:

MESSIANIC PHILOSOPHY: By Gideon W. B. Marsh. Pp. viii, 180. Price, 3s. 6d. 1908. A MAIDEN UP TO DATE. By Geneviève Irons. Pp. 308. Price, 6s. 1908.

R. and T. Washbourne, Ltd., London:

CHRIST AMONG MEN: By the Abbé Sertillanges. Translated by L. M. Ward. Pp. xvi, 152. Price, 2s. 1908. THORA: A GIRL ARTIST: By Ymal Oswin. Pp. 112. Price, 1s. 6d. net. 1908. CATECHISM ON MODERNISM: Translated from the French of J. B. Lemius, O.M.I. By J. Fitzpatrick, O.M.I. Pp. 136. Price, 6d. net. 1908.

SOME FOREIGN REVIEWS.

Summary of Contents.

I.

Studien und Mittheilungen (1908). No. I. and II.

- P. Claramunt.*—On the Number Twelve in Scripture.
J. Paech.—The History of the Abbey of Lubin.
T. Bühler.—Cardinal Pitra.
A. Steiger.—St. Bernard of Clairvaux.
B. Sepp.—A New Text of the Legend of St. Afra.
G. Holtum.—The Orthodoxy of Rupert of Deutz on the Eucharist.

II.

Archivum Franciscanum Historicum (1908). No. II. and III.

- T. Dominichelli.*—The "Leggenda Versificata" and the Earliest Poem of St. Francis.
B. Kleinschmidt.—Assisi, the Cradle of Italian Painting.
P. Duhem.—An unpublished fragment of Roger Bacon's "Opus Tertium."
T. Lemmens.—Thirteenth Century records of St. Francis.
F. ab Araules.—A short Life of St. Giles of Assisi.

III.

Stimmen aus Maria-Laach (1908). No. V.

- H. Pesch.*—Civilization, Progress, Reform.
J. Knabenbauer.—Jesus, and the near coming of the End of the World.
J. Bessmer.—The Holy Sacraments ("Lamentabili sane" 39—51).
H. Pesch.—The Classes of Society.
J. Braun.—The Chapel of the Sancta Sanctorum and its Treasure.

IV.

Rassegna Gregoriana (1908). May—June.

- K. Ott.*—The "Transitorium" in the Ambrosian Liturgy.
Y. Delaporte.—The Hymns of the Roman Breviary, 1568—1632.
Id.—The Hymns of the Roman Gradual.

V.

Der Katholik (1908). No. VI.

- J. Schmidlin.*—The Vindication of Ideas.
R. Adam.—The Chronology of Tertullian's Writings.
A. Huppertz.—The Conception of Sacrifice in the first three Centuries.
J. Selbst.—Questions of the Day.

VI.

Etudes (1908). June 5 and 20.

- J. Brucker.*—Modernism in Germany.
P. Duden.—Lamennais and the Jesuits.
S. M. Perrin.—Catholic Architecture.
J. de la Servière.—The Sources of the Roman Martyrology.
M. A. Dillet.—The Two Peace Conferences of the Hague.
J. M. Cros.—St. Ignatius Loyola and Daily Communion.
P. Carty.—Two Systems of Theosophy.

VII.

Revue Augustinienne (1908). May.

- P. Martain.*—St. Victricius in Rome in the Fifth Century.
A. Dossat.—The Doctrinal Crisis of French Protestantism.
A. Alvéry.—The last Stage of the Abbé Loisy.

